





*A. Benjamin
Rock mass. 15 November 1997*

THE
WORKS
OF
M. DE VOLTAIRE.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH;
WITH
NOTES, CRITICAL AND EXPLANATORY.

BY
WILLIAM CAMPBELL, LL.D.
J. JOHNSON, M.A. AND OTHERS.
UNDER THE DIRECTION OF
W. KENRICK, LL.D.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR FIELDING AND WALKER,
PATER-NOSTER ROW.

MDCCLXXIX.

31543.15

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

GIFT OF

BERNARD BERENSON

OCT 13 1938

W. DE VOLTAIRE

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH

BY J. M. G. LEITCH

WITH A FOREWORD BY THE AUTHOR

AND A HISTORY OF THE WORK

BY J. M. G. LEITCH

VOL. I

PRINTED FOR THE EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

LONDON AND NEW YORK

1938

P R E F A C E

THE superior *genius* of M. DE VOLTAIRE being not less various than extensive, it is under the several characters of an *Historian*, a *Poet*, and a *Moralist*, that he hath equally excited the admiration of his readers; in those several departments of *Literature*: and, though the *Critics* have been divided with respect to the degree of merit to be justly assigned him in these three characters, and particularly as to that in which he is to be judged most eminent, it is universally allowed that he is in all them excellent; bearing away the laurel in each, at least from his countrymen and cotemporaries.

As an *Historian*, his reputation is founded on the most permanent basis, from his extensive knowledge of human life, his vast reading, and his various attainments in all kinds of polite learning.

As a *Poet*, he was not less witty than ingenious, and though more pleasing and pathetic than profound and sublime, his style is elevated, his numbers melodious, his imagery lively, and his descriptions glowing, natural, and true. His *Henriade* is an excellent production, and his Tragedies are, for the most part, truly touching and poetical.

As a *Moralist*, if he soared not into the higher regions of philosophy, he was a proficient in the study of human nature; in so much that the cause of *justice* and *humanity* is indebted perhaps to the good-sense and benevolence of no modern writer so much as to those of M. DE VOLTAIRE. Of this, his admirable tracts on Penal Laws and Civil Government, his treatise on *Toleration*, with his spirited interposition in favour of the unfortunate family of the *Calas* (not to mention others) are instances that do the greatest honour to his memory.

In exhibiting this celebrated writer in these three characters, by furnishing the public in general with a compleat edition of his works, the proprietors propose also to accomodate
his

his admirers in each particular department, by arranging his pieces of different kinds in distinct parts, consisting of the requisite number of volumes; at the end of which will be given a copious Index to compleat each part, which will then severally compose distinct collections of his *historical*, his *poetical*, and of his *moral* productions.

To the whole, in like manner distinguished, will be added such of his *miscellaneous* performances on liberal and ludicrous subjects both in prose and verse, as are of a nature too repugnant to religious orthodoxy and moral delicacy to merit a place among his other pieces; but which, on account of the celebrity of the Author, or the wit and ingenuity of the productions themselves, may be acceptable to the reader; who may thus be supplied either with the *whole*, or such *parts*, of the works of this illustrious author, as accord with his *judgment*, or are agreeable to his *taste*.

his share in each particular department
by assigning his piece of office in kind in
distinct parts, consisting of the various
number of volumes; at the end of which
will be given a copious index to complete
each part which will then formally complete
distinct collections of his works, his
poetry, and of his moral productions.

To the whole in like manner distinguished
ed, will be added a list of his works, and
performances on liberal and humane subjects
both in prose and verse, as also of a
nature too numerous to mention, and
doxy, and moral, history, to merit a place
among his other pieces, but which, on ac-
count of the celebrity of the Author, or the
wit and humanity of the productions, these
themselves may be distinguished from the rest, who
may thus be furnished with the whole
or the part of the works, the Publisher
author, as according to his judgment, or ac-
cording to his taste.

A N
E S S A Y
O N T H E

MANNERS and SPIRIT of NATIONS,

A N D

On the Principal Occurrences in History from
CHARLEMAGNE to LOUIS XIII.

I N T R O D U C T I O N .

*Containing the Plan of the Work, with a concise Account of
the original State of the Western Nations, and the Reasons
for beginning this Essay with the East.*

I AM pleased to find that you are beginning to overcome the dislike you had conceived to modern history, since the decline of the Roman empire, and are wishing to take a general view of the nations which inhabit and desolate the earth. You are seeking in this immensity only such objects as are worthy of your attention; namely, the spirit, the manners, and the customs of the most considerable nations, supported by facts with which it would be inexcusable not to be acquainted. The end of this inquiry is not to learn in what year a prince, unworthy of being known, succeeded to a barbarous sovereign in an uncivilized nation. Any one who should be so unfortunate as to get the chronological series of all the Dynasties by heart, would acquire only a bare know-
B ledge

ledge of words. The more one ought to be acquainted with the great exploits of sovereigns, who have improved the manners and contributed to the happiness of their people, the less one need desire to know of the vulgar race of kings, who would serve only to burden the memory. Of what use to you would be a detail of so many petty interests which no longer subsist, and of such a number of extinct families, that contended for provinces, which were afterwards swallowed up in great kingdoms. Almost every city at present has its history, true or false, more ample, and more minute than that of Alexander. The bare annals of a monastic order contain more volumes than those of the Roman empire.

In these immense collections, the whole of which it is impossible to embrace, you must limit your reading and make some choice. It is like a great magazine, out of which you may take what will suit your purpose.

The illustrious Bossuet, who in his discourse on one part of the universal history, has entered into the true spirit of it, at least in what he says of the Roman empire, has descended no lower than Charlemagne. It is by beginning at that æra that you mean to form to yourself a general idea of the universe: but it will be often necessary for you to go back to more remote times. That eloquent writer takes but a slight notice of the Arabians who founded so potent an empire and so flourishing a religion, and speaks of them only as a swarm of barbarians. He seems to have written solely with a view to insinuate that every thing in the world was made for the use of the Jewish nation; that if God gave the empire of Asia to the Babylonians, it was done to punish the Jews; that if God placed Cyrus upon the throne, it was still with a view to correct that people; and that if God sent the Romans among them, it was done with the same intention. All this was possible. But the greatness of Cyrus and the Romans had other causes than these;

these; nor has Bossuet himself omitted them in speaking of the Spirit of Nations.

But it were to be wished that he had not been entirely silent in regard to the ancient inhabitants of the East, as the Indians and Chinese for instance, who were so considerable before any of the other nations were even formed.

Nourished with the produce of their lands, clothed with their silks, amused by the games which they invented, and even instructed by their moral fables, why should we neglect to be acquainted with the spirit of those nations, to whose coasts our European merchants did not fail to steer as soon as the way was laid open?

When you consider this globe as a philosopher, you first direct your attention to the East, the nursery of the arts, and from whence they have all been transmitted to the West.

The oriental climates towards the South have every thing from nature; and we in the North-west are indebted for all things to time, to commerce, and to tardy industry. Forests, stones, and wild fruits, constitute the whole natural product of the ancient country of the Celtes, the Allobroges, the Picts, the Germans, the Sarmatians, and the Scythians. The island of Sicily is said to produce of itself a little oats; but wheat, rice, and delicious fruits grow no where naturally except towards the Euphrates, in China, and in India. Fruitful countries were peopled the first, and the first civilized. The whole of the Levant, from Greece to the extremities of our hemisphere, was long celebrated in history, before we knew enough to convince us that we were barbarians. If we want to be informed in regard to our ancestors the Celtes, we must have recourse to the Greeks and the Romans, nations of a still much later date than the Asiatics.

If, for instance, the Gauls in the neighbourhood of the Alps joined the inhabitants of those mountains, and after settling on the banks of the Eridanus,

marched to Rome 361 years after its foundation, and laid siege to the capital, it is to the Romans we owe the information. That another body of those people, about an hundred years after, penetrated into Thessaly and Macedonia, and even advanced to the banks of the Euxine Sea, we are informed by the Greeks, although they omit to tell us what Gauls these were, or what road they took. We have no monument extant of those emigrations, which resemble those of the Tartars. They prove only that the nation was very numerous, but not civilized. The colony of Greeks who founded Marseilles six hundred years before our vulgar æra, could not polish Gaul; the Greek tongue did not even reach beyond the territory of that city.

We modern Gauls, Germans, Spaniards, Britons, and Sarmatians, know nothing of our history above eighteen centuries ago, except the little our conquerors were able to inform us of. We were even without fables, and had not so much as ventured to feign an original. The idle notion that all this western world was peopled by Gomer son of Japhet, was merely an oriental fable.

If the ancient Tuscans, from whom the earlier Romans derived their instruction, knew something more than the other western nations, it was because the Greeks had planted colonies among them; or rather because in all ages it was one of the properties of that country to produce men of genius, as the territory of Athens was more favourable to the arts than that of Thebes or Lacedemon. But what monuments have we of ancient Tuscany? none at all. We lose our time in idle conjectures about some unintelligible inscriptions, which have escaped the injuries of time. As to the other European nations, there is not so much as one inscription left in their ancient language.

The maritime part of Spain was discovered by the Phenicians, in the same manner as America has been
since

since discovered by the Spaniards. The Tyrians, the Carthaginians, the Romans, were successively enriched by the subterraneous treasures which they found in that country. The Carthaginians worked several mines there of great value, though not quite so rich as those of Peru and Mexico; time has since exhausted them, as it will exhaust those of the new world. Pliny relates that the Romans in the space of nine years, drew from thence eight thousand marks of gold, and about four and twenty thousand of silver. It must be acknowledged that those pretended descendants of Gomer, had made a very indifferent use of the presents of all sorts which the earth afforded them, since they were successively subdued by the Carthaginians, the Romans, the Vandals, the Goths, and the Arabs.

The little we know of the Gauls from Julius Cæsar and other Roman authors, gives us the idea of a people that stood in need of being subdued by an enlightened nation. The dialects of the ancient Celtic were frightful. The Emperor Julian, in whose time this language still continued to be spoken, says it resembled the croaking of ravens. Their manners, in Cæsar's time, were as uncivilized as their language. The Druids, those barbarous impostors, who were formed as it were for the people whom they governed, used to sacrifice human victims, which they burnt in a huge hollow pile of osier shaped like a statue. The Druidesses plunged a knife into the breasts of their prisoners, and formed their predictions from the manner in which the blood flowed. The great hollow stones, that have been found on the borders of Germany and Gaul, towards Strasburgh, are said to be the altars on which those sacrifices were offered. These are the only monuments of antient Gaul. The inhabitants of the coast of Biscay and Gascony used sometimes to feed on human flesh. We ought to turn aside our eyes from those savage times which are a disgrace to human nature,

We

We may reckon among the follies of the human mind, the idea that has prevailed, even in our times, of deriving the Celtes from the Hebrews. The Celtes sacrificed human victims, it is said, because Jephtha had offered up his daughter. The Druids were cloathed in white like the Jewish priests, and like these also they had a high priest. Their Druideffes were an imitation of Moses' sister and of Debora. The sacrifice of an indigent victim at Marseilles, decorated with flowers, and loaded with imprecations, is said to have owed its original to the *scape-goat*. They go so far as to find a resemblance between a few Celtic and Hebrew words, which are both pronounced with equal impropriety; (and hence it is inferred that the Jews and the Celtic nations are of the same stock.) In this manner we see reason insulted in universal histories, and the little knowlege we have of antiquity is confused by a mass of forced conjectures.

The Germans in their manners resembled the Gauls, for they sacrificed human victims, and decided their little private quarrels by single combat; only they were a little more uncouth and less industrious.

Cæsar tells us in his Commentaries, that their days of combat were always regulated by their sooth-sayers; and that when Ariovistus, one of their kings, conducted an hundred thousand of his wandering Germans to plunder the Gauls, whom Cæsar wishes rather to subdue than to pillage, he deputed two Roman officers to confer with the barbarian: when Ariovistus ordered them to be loaded with chains and offered up as sacrifices to the gods of the Germans, a sentence which was going to be put in execution, when Cæsar delivered them by his victory.

The only habitations of these barbarians were wretched huts, in which on one side lay the father, mother, sisters, brothers, children, all naked on straw, and on the other were their domestic animals; and yet we shall find that these very people were soon afterwards the masters of Rome. Tacitus extols the
manners

INTRODUCTION.

manners of the Germans; but, like Horace, who sings the praises of the uncivilized *Getæ*, both the one and the other were ignorant of the subject they were praising, and in fact aimed only at satirizing Rome. Nay Tacitus, in the midst of his panegyric, acknowledges, what every one knew, that the Germans chose rather to live by rapine than to cultivate their lands; and that after having pillaged their neighbours, they returned home to enjoy their booty. However, it was not possible always to live by plunder. The Roman Emperors checked or subdued these barbarians, and they were at length constrained to seek a livelihood by labour, which they considered as a misfortune.

When Cæsar went over to England, he found the inhabitants of that island still more savage than the Germans. Scarcely did they cover their nakedness with the skins of beasts. The women of a particular district were all in common to the men of the same district. Their dwellings were huts of reeds, and their only ornaments were figures which the men and the women imprinted on their bodies by pricking the skin, and making an infusion of the juice of herbs, as is still practised by the savages of America.

That human nature was plunged, during a long series of ages, into this condition so similar, and in many respects inferior to that of brutes, is but too true. The reason is said to be, that it is not in the nature of man to covet what he does not know. The human species every where required not only a prodigious space of time, but likewise a happy concurrence of circumstances, before they could raise themselves above animal life.

You are therefore very much in the right, in desiring to pass at once to those nations, that were civilized the first. It is possible that long before the empires of China and the Indies, there might have been learned, civilized, and powerful nations, whom a swarm of barbarians plunged once more into their
first

first state of ignorance and rudeness, which is called a state of pure nature.

The taking of Constantinople was alone sufficient to demolish the spirit of ancient Greece. The genius of the Romans was extinguished by the Goths. The coast of Africa, which were formerly so flourishing, are now no more than the rendezvous of pirates. Much greater changes must have happened in less happy climates. Natural causes must have been combined with the moral ones; for though the ocean cannot entirely change its bed, yet it is certain that it has alternately covered and withdrawn itself from vast tracts of land. Nature must have been necessarily exposed to a great number of calamities and vicissitudes.

The most pleasant and fruitful tracts of land in Europe, all the low countries that are watered by considerable rivers, were for a prodigious number of ages covered by the waters of the ocean. This truth is physically demonstrated by those deep and extensive beds of sea shells, which are found in the most inland situations, and which were gradually deposited there as the sea retired.

That those chains of mountains, however, which extend across the old and new world were formerly covered by the ocean, is by no means so certain.

1. Because many of these mountains are fifteen thousand feet and more above the level of the sea.
2. Because, if there was a time when the mountains did not exist, whence did these springs and rivers of fresh waters arise, which are so necessary to the lives of all animals? These mountains are reservoirs of water; they have different directions in the two hemispheres; they are, as Plato has said, the bones of this great animal the earth. We see that the most minute plants have an invariable structure. Why therefore should the earth be excepted from the general law?
3. If these mountains were supposed to have been covered with the waters, it would be a contradiction

in the order of nature, and a violation of the laws of gravity and hydrostaticks. 4. The bed of the ocean is hollow, and in this cavity there is no chain of mountains stretching from one pole to the other, or from East to West, as on the earth. We must therefore not conclude, that all this globe was for a long time covered with the sea, because many parts of it were. Neither should we infer that it once covered the Alps and the Cordilleras, because it has been spread over the lower parts of Gaul, Greece, Germany, Africa and India. We ought not to affirm that Mount Taurus was formerly navigable, because the Philippine and Molucca Islands were once a part of the continent. It is probable that the mountainous parts of the earth, have always been pretty nearly in the state they are now. It has been asserted indeed in many books, that a ship's anchor had been found on the very summit of the Alps, but this story is as false as all the other tales that are to be met with in books.

In natural philosophy we ought to admit only such points as have been proved, and in history only such as have the greatest degree of probability. It is possible that the mountains of the earth may have experienced, by volcanoes and earthquakes, as many changes as the flat countries.—But wherever there were springs and rivers there were mountains. A thousand local revolutions have certainly changed a part of the globe, both in a physical and a moral sense; but we know them not; and men were so late before they began to commence historians, that the human race, ancient as it is, appears new to us.

Besides, you begin your inquiries at the time, when our European chaos began to assume a new form after the decline of the Roman empire. Let us then survey this globe together. Let us see in what state it then was, and consider it in the same order as it seems to have been civilized, that is, by proceeding from the eastern nations to our own; and let us

give our attention first of all to a people, who had a connected history in a language already fixed, before we were even acquainted with the art of writing.

C H A P. I.

Of China, its Antiquity, Forces, Laws, Customs and Learning.

THE Empire of China, even in those days, was more extensive than that of Charlemagne, especially if we conclude Corea and Tonquin, provinces at that time tributary to the Chinese: it reaches about 30 degrees in longitude, and 24 in latitude. This state has subsisted in splendour about 4000 years, without either its laws, manners, language, or even the mode and fashion of dress having undergone any material alteration.

Its history, which is incontestable, being the only one founded on celestial observations, is traced by the most accurate chronology, so high as an eclipse calculated 2155 years before our vulgar æra, and verified by the missionaries skilled in mathematical learning, who having been sent in these latter times to preach the gospel to the people of this unknown nation, have admired and instructed them. Father Gaubil has examined a series of thirty-six eclipses of the sun, recorded in the books of Confucius, and found only two of them false and two doubtful.

It is true that Alexander had sent from Babylon into Greece the observations of the Chaldeans, who ascended 400 years higher than the Chinese; and doubtless this is one of the most valuable monuments of antiquity. But these ephemerides of Babylon were not connected with historical facts; whereas the Chinese have joined the celestial to the terrestrial history, and thus proved the one by the other.

According to authentic testimonies, their chronology ascends uninterruptedly two hundred and thirty years beyond the above-mentioned eclipse, as high as the emperor Hiao, who took some pains himself to correct their astronomy, and who during a reign of about 80 years, made it his study to promote the knowledge and happiness of mankind. His name is still held in veneration in China, as in Europe we venerate the names of the Titus's, the Trajans, and the Antonines. His being an able mathematician for his time, shews that his nation was already much civilized. We do not find that the ancient chiefs of the German or Gallic tribes reformed astronomy. Clovis had no observatory.

We find that six kings preceded Hiao, but the length of their reigns is uncertain. The best way, in my opinion, where chronology is silent, is to have recourse to Sir Isaac Newton's rule, who having composed one common year for the time which the princes of different countries reigned, reduces each reign to twenty-two years or thereabouts. According to this calculation, which is the more reasonable as being the most moderate, those six kings must have reigned very near 130 years: and this is far more agreeable to the order and course of nature, than the 250 years, for example, attributed to the seven kings of Rome; or than the many other calculations that have been contradicted by the experience of all ages.

The first of those kings, named *Fohi*, reigned therefore at least five and twenty centuries before our vulgar æra, at a time when the Babylonians had already a series of astronomical observations: and from that time China was subject to one sovereign. Its fifteen kingdoms, united under one head, are a sufficient proof that long before that time this country was very populous, civilized, and divided into many sovereignties: for a great empire is never formed but out of several petty states; this being the work of

policy, courage, and above all, of time; there cannot therefore be a stronger proof of antiquity.

It is reported in the Five Kings, the most ancient and authentic of all the Chinese books, that in the reign of the Emperor Yo, the fourth in succession to Fohi, there was observed a conjunction of *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, *Mars*, *Mercury* and *Venus*. Our modern astronomers dispute among themselves concerning the time of this conjunction, though they certainly ought not to do this: for even supposing the Chinese to have been mistaken in this celestial observation, the very mistake was glorious. The Chinese books expressly assure us, that from time immemorial it was known in that country, that Venus and Mercury turn round the Sun. It would therefore be rejecting the common lights of reason, not to perceive that such a knowledge supposes a vast number of preceding ages. What renders those first writings so respectable, and gives them such an acknowledged superiority over all those that relate to the origin of other nations is, that we meet with no prodigies in them, no predictions, none of those political impostures which we ascribe to the founders of other states; excepting perhaps that which has been imputed to Fohi; of having given out that he saw his laws written on the back of a winged serpent. But even this imputation proves that writing was known to the Chinese before the time of Fohi. In short, it is not for us in this western extremity of the globe, to dispute the archives of a nation who were compleatly civilized, when we were no better than savages.

A tyrant, named Chi-Hoangti, commanded indeed that all books should be burnt; but this mad and barbarous order rather induced people to preserve them with care, and accordingly they appeared again after his decease. But what does it signify, after all, whether those books always include a sure chronology or not? Suppose we know not exactly at what time Charlemagne lived: as it is certain that he made

made vast conquests with large armies, it appears that he was born in a numerous nation, formed into a body by a long succession of ages. Since therefore the Emperor Hiao, who undeniably lived about two thousand four hundred years before our æra, subdued the whole country of Corea, it is certain that his people were of the very remotest antiquity.

Besides, the Chinese invented a cycle, a computation of time which begins 2602 years before our time. Is it for us then to dispute a chronology which has been unanimously received by a whole people, for us, who have at least sixty different systems for determining ancient dates, and consequently not one on which we can depend?

Mankind do not multiply so easily as we imagine. One third part of the number of infants die at the age of ten. The calculators of the propagation of the human species have observed, that there must be favourable circumstances for an nation to encrease a twentieth part in the space of an hundred years: and it often happens that the number of inhabitants diminishes instead of increasing.

Certain learned chronologists have computed, that from one single family remaining after the deluge, the members of which were constantly employed in procreation and their children the same, there was begotten in the space of two hundred and fifty years, a much greater number of inhabitants than the whole world at present contains. Neither the Talmud nor the Arabian Nights ever produced any thing so absurd. It has already been remarked, that children are not to be begotten by a stroke of the pen. Observe our colonies, look at the immense cluster of Islands in Asia which are never quitted by their inhabitants; or the Maldivian, Philippine and Molucca Islands, and you will find that neither of these have a sufficient number of inhabitants. This is a further proof of the antiquity of China. In the reign of Charlemagne, and long before, it was even more populous than extensive.

The

The last register that we know of, made in the fifteen provinces that compose China properly so called, amounts to near sixty millions of men able to bear arms, without including either the veteran troops, the old men above sixty, or the young men under twenty, or the *Mandarins*, or the multitude of literati, or the *Bonzes*, and much less the women, who in all countries are in number equal to the men, within a 15th or 16th part, according to the observations of those who have made the exactest calculations in regard to the human species. At this rate there can hardly be less than 130 millions of inhabitants in China; Europe has not much more than 100 millions, reckoning twenty millions in France, two and twenty in Germany, four in Hungary, ten in all Italy as far as Dalmatia, eight in Great-Britain and Ireland, eight in Spain and Portugal, ten in European Russia, six in Poland, six in Turkey in Europe, Greece and the Islands, four in Sweden, three in Norway and Denmark, and about four in Holland and the Low Countries.

We are therefore not to be surprised that the cities of China are immensely large; that Pekin, the new capital of the empire, is above six leagues in circumference, and contains about three millions of inhabitants; that Nanquin, the ancient metropolis, had formerly a greater number: that a simple country town called Quientzeng, where they manufacture their porcelain, contains about a million of people.

The journal of the Chinese Empire, a journal by the bye which is the most authentic and useful of any in the world, since it contains a detail of all the public wants, and of the resources and interests of all the orders of the state. This journal, I say, relates that in the year of our æra 1725, the wife of the Emperor Yontchin, whom he had declared Empress, distributed presents to all the poor women in China who were above seventy years of age, according to an ancient custom. This journal reckons in the single province

provi
of ag
40,89
an hu
must
donat
it in
numb
then
if ea
throu
must

TH
count
velled
well
horfe
grou
journ
ries,
the f
fon,
ficient
which
larly
those

TH
tions
tions
ramp
the C
follw
other
fortif
rated
which
befor
of fiv
tains

province of Canton 98,220 women, of seventy years of age, who received the bounty on this occasion, 40,893 of eighty and upwards, and 3,453 who were an hundred years of age. How many women then must there have been who were not entitled to this donation? we have here above 142,000 who received it in one single province. These are among the number accounted of no use to the state. How great then must be the population of this country? And if each of these received the value of ten livres * throughout the empire, to what an immense sum must this have amounted!

The forces of this empire, according to the accounts of the most intelligent persons that ever travelled, consist in a militia of about 800,000 soldiers well maintained; five hundred and seventy thousand horses are fed in the emperor's stables or pasture grounds, for mounting the cavalry, for the court journies, and for public couriers. Several missionaries, whom the Emperor Cangji, from his love of the sciences, had in these latter times about his person, affirm, that they attended him in those magnificent hunting matches towards Great Tartary, in which 100,000 horse and 60,000 foot marched regularly in order of battle. This has been a custom in those countries time immemorial.

The Chinese towns had never any other fortifications than such as good sense pointed out to all nations, before the use of artillery; namely, a ditch, a rampart, a strong wall, and towers: and even since the Chinese have made use of cannon, they have not followed the model of our fortresses; but whereas other nations fortify their towns, these people have fortified their empire. The great wall which separated and defended China against the Tartars, and which was built an hundred and thirty-seven years before our æra, subsists to this day on a circumference of five hundred leagues, rising on the tops of mountains, and descending down into precipices, being almost

* A sum equivalent to 8s. 6d. sterling.

almost every where twenty feet broad, and above thirty feet high: a monument superior to the pyramids of Egypt, both by its utility and immensity.

This rampart however did not hinder the Tartars from making a proper use of the divisions of the Chinese, and conquering that empire; but the constitution of the state was neither altered nor weakened by this revolution. The country of the conquerors is become part of the conquered state; and the Mantchoux Tartars, now masters of China, have only submitted with sword in hand to the laws of the country whose throne they invaded.

There is a passage in the third book of Confucius, which proves how very ancient is the use of armed chariots. In his time the viceroys or governors of provinces were obliged to furnish the head of the state, or emperor, with a thousand chariots of war drawn by four horses abreast. Homer, who flourished a long time after the Chinese philosopher, never speaks of chariots with more than two or three horses abreast. The Chinese had without doubt begun with and had attained to the perfect management of those with four horses. But neither the Greeks in the time of the Trojan war, nor the Chinese, appear to have made any use of single cavalry, and yet it is almost beyond dispute, that the method of fighting on horseback was prior to the use of chariots. We are told that the Pharaohs of Egypt had cavalry, but they likewise made use of chariots of war. It is probable however that in a marshy country like Egypt, and intersected with so many canals, the number of horses was never very great.

With regard to the finances, the Emperors ordinary revenue, according to the most probable calculations, amounts to two hundred millions of ounces of silver. It is proper to observe, that the ounces of silver is not worth one hundred French sous* intrinsic value, as the history of China asserts; for there is no such thing as intrinsic numerical value; but taking the silver mark

at

* About 4s. 2d. sterling.

at 50 livres, as reckoned in France, this sum amounts to 1250 millions of French money in 1740*. I mention this date, because this arbitrary value has but too greatly changed, and perhaps will change still in this kingdom; this is a point which several writers who are better acquainted with books than public affairs, do not seem sufficiently to attend to; and hence it is that they are frequently so defective in their valuation of foreign coins.

They had gold and silver coin long before the daries were struck in Persia. The Emperor Cang-hi had collected a series of 3000 of these pieces, among which were several struck in India; another proof of the antiquity of the arts in Asia. But gold for a long time has ceased to be a common measure in China; having become a merchandise as in Holland; neither do they coin any silver, but settle the value of this metal by the weight and standard: they coin nothing but copper, which alone has an arbitrary value in this country. In difficult times, the government has made use of a paper currency, as since hath been practised by several states in Europe; but the Chinese never had any such thing as public banks, which augment the riches of a nation by multiplying its credit.

This country, which is so favoured by nature, produces all the different sorts of fruit that have been transplanted into Europe, and a great many others which we are strangers to. Their lands are covered with wheat, rice, vines, pulse, and trees of every kind; but it is in these later times only that the inhabitants have made wine, having been satisfied with a liquor of sufficient strength, which they have learnt to extract from rice.

The valuable insect that produces silk is originally from China, from whence it was carried into Persia, though not till very late, together with the art of

* About 52 millions sterling.

weaving the down, in which it is enveloped. This manufacture was so very scarce, even in Justinian's time, that silk was sold in Europe for its weight in gold.

A fine paper, and of a shining white, has been manufactured by the Chinese time immemorial from the threads of boiled bamboo. We are unable to ascertain the first invention of their porcelain, or of that beautiful varnish which we begin now to imitate and to rival in Europe.

They have known how to manufacture glass these 2000 years, but their glass is neither so fine nor so transparent as ours.

Printing was invented by them about the same time. It is well known that their method of printing is by engraving on wooden blocks, in the way first practised by Guttenberg at Mayence in the fifteenth century. The art of stamping characters on wood is more improved in China; our method of using moveable and metal types, though greatly superior to theirs, has not yet been adopted by them; so much are they attached to all their ancient customs.

The use of bells is of the highest antiquity with them. In France we had none before the sixth century of our æra. They have cultivated chemistry; and though they have made no great improvements in natural philosophy, they invented gun-powder; but they never use it except at festivals, in the exhibiting of fire-works, in which they surpass other nations. It was the Portuguese that in these latter ages first taught them the use of artillery, and the Jesuits that learnt them to found cannon. If the Chinese did not apply themselves to the invention of these destructive instruments, we ought not on that account to praise their virtue, since they have nevertheless been accustomed to war.

They penetrated deeply into astronomy, but only so far as it is a science depending on ocular observation, and the fruit of patience. They were
affiduous

assiduous observers of the heavens, remarked all the phænomena, and transmitted them to posterity. They divided as we do the annual course of the sun into 365 parts and a quarter; and had a confused knowledge of the precession of the equinoxes and solstices. But what is most worthy of observation is, that, time immemorial, they have divided their months into weeks of seven days. The Indians likewise did this; the same method was followed by the Chaldeans, and afterwards in the little country of Judea, but was never adopted in Greece.

They still shew the instruments which one of their celebrated astronomers made use of a thousand years before our æra, in a city which is only of the third order.

In Nankin, the ancient capital, they have preserved a brazen globe, which three men are unable to embrace; it stands on a cube of brass, which opens, and receives a man, who turns the globe round; and on it are drawn the meridians and parallels.

Pekin has an observatory full of astrolabes and armillary spheres, inferior indeed to our instruments for exactness, but yet sufficient proofs of the superiority of the Chinese over the other nations of Asia.

They were acquainted with the compass, but without applying it to its right use in navigation. They sailed only along the coast; for as they inhabited a land that abounds with every thing, they had no need like us to traverse the globe. The compass as well as gunpowder, was to them only a matter of curiosity; nor indeed were they the more to be lamented on this account.

It has been a matter of surprize that this inventive nation never went beyond the elements of geometry. It is certain that they were acquainted with these elements many ages before Euclid had reduced them to method among the Greeks of Alexandria. The Emperor Cang-hi in our times assured Father Parenin,

one of the wisest and most learned of the missionaries who had access to that Prince, that the Emperor Yu had adopted the properties of the rectangular triangle in drawing the geographical plan of a province, more than 3960 years ago ; and Father Parenin himself quotes a book written above 1100 years before our vulgar æra, in which it is asserted that the famous demonstration, which has been attributed in the western part to Pythagoras, had long been one of those theorems which were the most generally known.

It has been asked why the Chinese, who were so far advanced in such remote times, have never extended their discoveries ? Why their astronomy is so ancient, and at the same time so limited, and why they are still unacquainted with the semi-tones in music ? It would seem as if nature had given to this species of men so different from ours, organs for discovering at once whatever was necessary for them, and incapable of going any further. We, on the contrary, have made our discoveries very late ; but we have been quick in bringing things to perfection. But what is less surprizing is, that these people have always blended their errors in judicial astrology with the truth of their celestial observations. This superstition has been common to all mankind ; nor is it long since we ourselves have recovered from it, such is the proneness of human nature to error.

If any one should inquire why so many arts and sciences, after having been cultivated without interruption during a long succession of ages in China, should however be so little advanced, we may perhaps assign two reasons : one is, the great respect these people have for whatever has been transmitted to them by their ancestors, and which makes them look upon every thing as perfect that bears the stamp of antiquity ; the other is the nature of their language, the first principle of all human knowledge.

The art of communicating our ideas in writing, which should be a plain, easy method, is with them a

thing

thing of the greatest difficulty. Every word has a different character; and in China a learned man is he who knows most of these characters, so that a great many arrive at an old age before they know how to write well.

What they seem to understand best, to have the most cultivated, and to have brought to the greatest perfection, is morality and the laws. The respect which children bear to their parents, is the foundation of the Chinese government. Paternal authority is so strongly supported among them, that a son cannot go to law with his father but by the consent of all his relations and friends, and of the magistrates. The learned mandarins are considered as fathers of the towns and provinces, and the king as father of the empire: this principle ingrafted in their breasts, has made as it were only one family of this vast empire.

It being therefore a fundamental law that the whole nation is to be considered as one family, the public good has been considered as the leading duty amongst them more than in any other country. It is to this we are to attribute the incessant care of the emperor, and the different tribunals to repair the great roads, to join rivers, to form canals and to encourage the cultivation of lands and manufactures.

In another chapter we shall speak of the government of China. In the mean while, however, you are to observe that travellers, and particularly the missionaries, have fancied they saw there only the marks of despotism. Men judge of every thing from external appearance: they see people prostrate themselves on the earth before another, and from thence they conclude them to be slaves. They imagine that the person who is thus revered, must necessarily be the absolute master of the lives and fortunes of an hundred millions of men, and that his will must be considered as law. This however is not the case, as we shall shew more at large in another place. It will here be sufficient to observe that in the earliest

liest times of this monarchy, the people were permitted to write down, on a long table placed in the palace, any thing they might consider as reprehensible in the government; that this custom was vigorously adopted during the reign of Venti, two centuries before our vulgar æra; and that in times of peace the representations of the tribunals have always had the force of law. This important observation, at once destroys the vague imputations we meet with in the Spirit of Laws against this government, which is the most ancient of any in the world.

Every kind of vice exists in China as in other countries, but it is certainly more restrained there by the laws, than elsewhere, because, those laws are always uniform. The learned author of Lord Anson's voyage, expresses great contempt for China, because the lower sort of people in Canton imposed upon the English as much as they could. But ought we to judge of the government of a great nation from the manners of the populace on the frontiers? And what would the Chinese have said of us, if they had been shipwrecked upon our coasts, at a time when the laws of European nations confiscated shipwrecked effects, and when custom authorized the murder of the proprietors?

The continual ceremonies with which society is encumbered in China, and with which friendship alone can induce them to dispense with in domestic retirement, has led to the establishment of a certain diffidence and decorum throughout the empire, which gives at once gravity and mildness to their manners. These qualities are extended even to the lowest class of people. The missionaries relate, that even in the public market-place, in the midst of the hurry and confusion, which excite such horrid noise and imprecations in our parts of the world, they have often seen the peasants fall upon their knees, according to the custom of the country, and ask one another pardon for the trouble which each of them imputed to himself,

himself, and then assist each other in setting things right with the utmost tranquillity.

The laws, in other countries, are framed for the punishment of crimes; in China they do more than this, they reward virtue. If the report of a generous and signal action is spread through a province, the Mandarin is obliged to make it known to the Emperor, who presently sends a badge of honour to the person who has so just a claim to it. Within our times, a poor peasant named Chicou, who had found a purse filled with money that had been lost by some traveller, carried it to the province in which the traveller resided, and gave it into the hands of the magistrate of the district, without being willing to accept any recompence for his trouble. The magistrate was obliged, on pain of being removed from his post, to give notice of this action to the supreme tribunal at Pekin; from this court the information was transmitted to the Emperor, and the poor peasant was created a Mandarin of the fifth order: for there are places of Mandarins for the peasants who distinguish themselves by their morality, as well as for those who succeed the best in agriculture. It must be acknowledged, that amongst us, such a man would be distinguished only by increasing his taxes, because we should imagine him to be more at his ease.

This morality, and this submission to the laws, joined to the worship of a Supreme Being, constitute the religion of China, as professed by the Emperor and the men of letters. The Emperor has been high pontif time immemorial; it is he who sacrifices to *Tien*, the supreme ruler of heaven and earth: he is considered also as the first philosopher and first preacher in the empire; and his edicts are generally instructions and lessons of morality.

C H A P. II.

Of the Religion of China.—That the Government is not atheistical; that Christianity was not preached there in the seventh Century. Of certain Sects established in the Country.

IN the last century we were not sufficiently acquainted with China. Vossius admired it in every thing with exaggeration. Renaudot, who was his rival, and averse to men of letters, carried the spirit of contradiction so far as to pretend to despise and even to calumniate the Chinese. Let us endeavour to avoid these excesses.

Congfutzee, whom we call Confucius, and who flourished two thousand three hundred years ago, a little before Pythagoras, was the founder of this religion, which consists in being just: he taught and practised it both in a state of grandeur and in poverty; at a time when he was first minister to a king who was tributary to the Emperor, and afterwards when in exile and a fugitive in distress. In his lifetime he had five thousand disciples, and after his death his doctrine was embraced by the Emperors, and the *Colaos*, that is, the Mandarins, the men of letters, and all who are above the lower class of people.

He begins his book by saying, that whoever is destined to govern ought “to purify the reason which he has received from heaven, in the same manner as we cleanse a mirror when it is tarnished;” and likewise that “he ought to model himself anew, that his people may do the same after his example.” Every thing he says has a similar tendency. He does not pretend to be a prophet or to have the gift of inspiration. All his aim seems to be to restrain the passions; he writes only as a philosopher, and as such only is he considered

sidered by the Chinese. His morality is as pure, as severe, and at the same time as humane as that of Epictetus. We never find him saying, "*Do not to others that which thou wishest not to be done unto thee;*" but "*Do unto others only what thou wouldst have done unto thyself.*" He recommends the forgiveness of injuries, and the cultivation of friendship and humility. His disciples lived together as brethren, and the happiest and most respectable times of the world were those in which his laws were followed.

His family still exists: and in a country where there is no other title of nobility but that derived from actual services, it is distinguished from all other families in memory of its founder. As for himself, no divine honours have indeed been paid to him, for these are due to no human creature, but he has received such as a man deserves who has given the purest ideas of the Supreme Being that the human mind, unassisted by revelation, can possibly form to itself. For which reason Father le Comte and the other missionaries have remarked that the Chinese acknowledged the true God, at a time when other nations were idolators, and that they sacrificed to him in the most ancient temple in the universe.

The reproach of atheism, which we in this western hemisphere are so apt to bestow upon every body that is not of the same way of thinking as ourselves, has been lavished on the Chinese. Nothing but the inconsiderate manner in which we carry on all our disputes, could have made us presume to treat a government as atheistical, most of whose edicts * speak of a supreme being, father of nations, recompensing, and punishing with justice, who has established betwixt man and himself a correspondence of prayers and benefits, of transgressions and chastisements.

* See the edict of the Emperor Yonchin, which Father du Halde has given in his History of China.

The Missionaries, who were in opposition to the Jesuits, have always pretended that the government of China was atheistical, because it was favourable to the interests of the latter. But the testament of the Emperor Cang-hi, in which are the following expressions, will surely be sufficient to silence this party rage. "I am seventy years of age, and of these I have reigned sixty and one; I am indebted for this favour to the protection of heaven and earth, to my ancestors, and to God, who directs the empire; I cannot attribute it to my own feeble virtue."

Their religion, it is true, does not admit of eternal rewards and punishments; and this is a proof of its great antiquity. Moses himself makes no mention of a future state. The Sadducees did not believe it; this doctrine has been happily established in the West only by the master of life and death.

The Chinese literati have been supposed to have no distinct idea of an immaterial God; but it is wrong to infer from thence that they are atheists. The ancient Egyptians, a people so very religious, did not worship Isis and Osiris as pure spirits. All the gods of antiquity were adored under a human form: and among the Greeks all were stigmatized as atheists, who would not allow of corporeal dignities, and who adored in the divinity an unknown nature, invisible, inaccessible to our senses: a farther proof this, by the bye, of the injustice of mankind.

The celebrated Archbishop Navaretta* says, that according to all the interpreters of the sacred books of

* In a learned work written in the Spanish language, and entitled *Tradados historicos, politicos, ethicos, y religiosos de la monarchia de China*, which was intended to have been comprized in three volumes, but the second was condemned by the Inquisition, and the third never made its appearance. The author, who was originally a Dominican friar, had been sent as a missionary to China, where he made himself so perfectly master

the Chinese, *the soul is an aerial, fiery particle, which after separating itself from the body is re-united to the celestial substance.* This was likewise the opinion of the Stoics, and is admirably described by Virgil in the sixth book of his *Æneid*. Now surely neither the *Manual of Epictetus*, nor Virgil's *Æneid* are infected with atheism. All the primitive fathers of the church thought after the same manner. We have slandered the Chinese, merely because their metaphysics differ from ours. We ought rather to admire in them the two virtues which lead them to condemn the superstitions of the Pagans and the manners of the Christians. The religion of the literati was never disgraced by fables, or stained by quarrels and civil wars.

In imputing atheism to the government of this vast empire, we have been so inconsiderate also as to charge it with idolatry, by an accusation which as it were contradicts itself. The great mistake concerning the Chinese rites proceeds from our judging of their customs by our own; for we carry the prejudices of our contentious spirit to the extremity of the earth. A genuflexion, which with them is only a common civility, appears to us an act of adoration; and a table we mistake for an altar. Thus it is we judge of every thing. We shall see hereafter how our divisions and disputes occasioned the missionaries to be driven out of China.

Some time before Confucius, Laokium had introduced a sect that believed in wicked spirits, enchantments, and witchcraft; another sect similar to that of Epicurus was received, though with some opposition, in China, five hundred years before the birth of Christ. But in the first century of our æra this

master of the Chinese language, as to be able not only to speak it fluently, but to write it with ease. After his return he was appointed to the archbishopric of St. Domingo in America, where he died in 1689. T.

country was over-run by the superstition of the Bonzes, who brought from India the idol Fo or Foe, which is worshipped under different names by the Tartars and Japanese; a pretended divinity descended upon the earth, to whom they pay a worship the most ridiculous, and of consequence the best adapted to the stupid vulgar. This religion, which had its first rise in India almost a thousand years before Christ, has infected the whole of oriental Asia: this is the god which the Bonzes preach in China, the Talapoins in Siam, and the Lamas in Tartary. It is in his name that they promise immortal life, and that thousands of Bonzes consecrate their days to such penitential exercises as are shocking to human nature: some spend their whole life in chains, others wear an iron collar which bends their bodies double, and holds their faces down to the ground. Their fanaticism is infinitely subdivided; they are supposed to expel devils and to work miracles; and they sell their absolutions to the people. This sect sometimes succeeds in seducing even the Mandarins, and by a fatality which shews that the same superstition is common to all nations, some Mandarins have turned Bonzes and shaved their heads out of devotion.

It is these Bonzes that in Tartary have the Dalailama for their chief, a living idol whom they adore; and this perhaps is the highest pitch of human superstition.

This Dalailama, the successor and vicerent of the god Fo, is supposed to be immortal. The priests always train up a young Lama, who is intended to be the secret successor of the Supreme Pontiff, and takes his place as soon as he, whom the people believe immortal, is dead. The Tartar princes never speak to him but upon their knees, and he ultimately decides the several points of faith on which the Lamas are divided. In short, he has for some time past been master of the country of Thibet that lies west of China.

The

The Emperor receives his ambassadors, and sends him considerable presents.

These sects are tolerated in China for the use of the vulgar, as a coarse sort of food calculated for them; while the magistrates and the literati, who are in every respect distinct from the common people, feed on a purer substance. Yet Confucius was greatly concerned at this deluge of errors; there were a great many idolaters in his time. The sect of Laokium had already introduced superstitions among the people. *How comes it to pass*, says he in one of his books, *that the ignorant populace are guilty of more crimes than the learned? It is because the populace are governed by the Bonzes.*

Many of the learned have indeed fallen into the error of materialism, but their morality has not been affected by this. They think that virtue is so necessary to mankind, and so amiable in itself, that they have no occasion for the knowledge of a God to follow it. Besides, we ought not to suppose that all the Chinese materialists are atheists, since the primitive fathers of the Church believed God and the angels to be corporeal.

In reality we are unacquainted even with matter, and much less do we know of what is immaterial. The Chinese are not more informed on this head than ourselves, and their learned have contented themselves with adoring a Supreme Being. Of this there can be no doubt.

The opinion that God and his angels were corporeal was an old metaphysical error; but absolutely to believe that there is no God would be a horrid error in morality, and incompatible with a wise government. It is a contradiction worthy of ourselves, to exclaim, as we have done, with vehemence against Bayle, for believing that a Society of Atheists may possibly subsist, and to cry out with the same violence that the wisest empire in the universe is founded on the principles of atheism.

Father

Father Fouquet, a Jesuit, who had lived five and twenty years in China, and who came back from it a declared enemy to the Jesuits, has often told me that in China there were very few of the philosophers atheists. The case is the same among us.

It is pretended that the Christian religion was known in China towards the eighth century, before the time of Charlemagne. It has been asserted that our missionaries discovered an inscription in Syriac and Chinese characters in the province of Kingt-ching. This monument, which the reader may see at length in Kircher, mentions, that a holy man, named Olopuen, conducted by blue clouds, and observing the direction of the winds, came from Tacin to China in the year 1092 of the æra of the Seleucidæ, which answers to the year 636 of Jesus Christ; and that as soon as he arrived in the suburbs of the imperial city, the Emperor sent a *Colao* out to meet him, and built a Christian church for his use.

It is evident by the very inscription itself, that this is one of those pious frauds which have always been too easily tolerated. The learned Navaretta allows this. This country of Tacin, this æra of the Seleucidæ, this name of Olopuen, which, they say, is Chinese, and resembles an ancient Spanish name; these *blue clouds*, which serve as guides, this Christian church built on a sudden at Pekin for a Priest of Palestine, who could not set foot in China without incurring the pain of death; all shew the ridiculousness of such a supposition. They who endeavour to defend it, do not reflect, that the priests whose names are mentioned in this pretended monument, were Nestorians, and consequently that they are only contending for heretics.

We must rank this inscription with that at Malabar, in which it is said that St. Thomas arrived in that country, in the quality of a carpenter, with a rule and a stake, and that he carried along a large beam of wood as a proof of his mission. There are historical

truths enough, without mixing with them these absurd lies.

It is very certain that in the time of Charlemagne, the Christian religion (as well as the people who profess it) had always been absolutely unknown to the Chinese. Indeed there were some Jews in that country. Several families of that vagrant and superstitious nation, were settled there two centuries before our vulgar æra; and followed the business of brokers, which the Jews practise in almost every part of the world.

I shall defer saying any thing of Siam, Japan, and all that tract of country towards the East and South, till I come to the period at which an easy passage was opened to those extremities of our hemisphere, by the industry of the Europeans.

C H A P. III.

Of INDIA.

FOLLOWING the apparent course of the sun, the next country I come to, is India or Indostan, a country as extensive as China, and more known by the precious commodities that have been derived from it, by the industry of merchants in all ages, than from any exact descriptions of it. This country is the only one in the world that produces those spices, which the temperance of the natives can do without, but which are essential to the epicurism of the inhabitants of these northern climates.

A chain of mountains but little interrupted, seems to have fixed its limits towards China, Tartary and Persia; and the rest is surrounded by the sea. And yet India on this side the Ganges, was for a long time

time subject to the Persians ; for which reason Alexander the revenger of Greece and the conqueror of Darius, pushed his conquests even into that part of India which was tributary to his enemy. Since the time of Alexander, the Indians have lived in a licentiousness and effeminacy inspired by the goodness of the climate, and the richness of the soil.

The Greeks travelled thither in search of knowledge, before the reign of Alexander. There the celebrated Pilpay, two thousand three hundred years ago, wrote his Moral Fables that have since been translated into almost all the languages of the earth.

Every thing has been treated in the form of a fable or allegory by the Orientals, and particularly the Indians. Pythagoras, a disciple of the Gymnosophists, would alone serve as a sufficient proof that true science was cultivated in India. A legislator in politics and geometry would not have continued long in a school, where they taught nothing but words. It is even very probable that Pythagoras learnt from the Indians the properties of the rectangular triangle, the honour of which has been ascribed to him. That which was so well known in China, might easily be so in India. It was asserted, long after his time, that he sacrificed an hundred bullocks for this discovery. This offering was rather extravagant for a philosopher. It is certainly becoming a wise man to return thanks for a happy thought, to the Being to whom we are indebted for all our knowledge as well as for our existence. But it is much more likely that Pythagoras, was indebted for this theorem to the Gymnosophists, than that he sacrificed an hundred bullocks. Long before the time of Pilpay, the Indian sages had been accustomed to treat morality and philosophy under the veil of allegory and fable. When they wished to express the equity of any one of their kings, they said, "That the gods who preside over the different elements, being at variance among themselves, had chosen him to be their umpire."

Their

Their ancient traditions speak of a judgement, which is pretty much like Solomon's. They have a fable which is exactly similar to that of Jupiter and Amphitryon, but is more ingenious. A sage discovers which of the two is the god and which the mortal. These traditions prove the great antiquity of those allegories, which make all extraordinary men to be of divine origin. The Greeks derived all their mythology from India and Egypt. All these fables originally included a philosophical meaning; this meaning has been lost, but the fables remain.

The antiquity of the arts in India has always been acknowledged by all other nations. There is still extant an account written by two Arabian travellers, who visited India and China a little before the reign of Charlemagne, and four hundred years before the celebrated Marco Paolo. These Arabians pretend to have conversed with the Emperor who reigned at that time in China, and to have been told by him that he only reckoned five great kings in the world, and that he ranked in that number, "The King of the Elephants and Indians, who is called the King of Wisdom, because all knowledge comes originally from India."

I acknowledge that these Arabians, after the manner of all the Oriental writers, have filled their accounts with fables, but still I think their relation sufficiently proves, that the Indians were considered throughout the East, as the inventors of the arts; whether we suppose this acknowledgment to have been really made by the Emperor, or to have been simply the opinion of the travellers themselves.

It is indisputable that the most ancient systems of theology were invented in India. They have two books, written about 5000 years ago in the *Hanscrit* or *San scrit* tongue, an ancient language which they consider as sacred. The first of these books is the *Shasta*, and the second the *Vedam*. The *Shasta* begins in the manner following :

F

" The

“ The Eternal, absorbed in the contemplation of
 “ his existence, resolved in the fulness of time to
 “ form beings which might participate of his
 “ essence and bliss. These beings were not; he
 “ willed and they had existence.”

It is obvious, that this exordium which is truly sublime, and which for many ages was unknown to other nations, has been but feebly imitated by them.

These new beings were the demi-gods, which were adopted by the Chaldeans, and afterwards among the Greeks by Plato. The Jews admitted them during their captivity in Babylon. It was there they learnt the names the Chaldeans had given to the angels, and which were not such as they had derived from the Indians. *Michael, Gabriel, Raphael*, and even *Israel* are Chaldean words which were never known in India.

It is in the *Shasta* likewise that we meet with an account of the fall of the angels. Here is the manner in which it is related*: “ After the creation of the
 “ *Debtalog*, (that is, of the angels) joy and harmony
 “ for a long time surrounded the throne of the
 “ Eternal. This felicity would have continued till

* The serpent spoken of in Genesis became the principal wicked angel. Sometimes the name of *Satan*, which is a Persian word, was given to him, and sometimes that of *Lucifer*, or *Star of the Morning*, because the vulgar translated the word *Helel* by that of *Lucifer*. Isaiah, insulting at the death of a King of Babylon says to him, by a figure of rhetoric, *How art thou fallen Lucifer, Star of the Morning?* This name has been given to the devil and the passage applied to the fall of the angels. Milton has likewise made it the foundation of his poem, but there is much less probability in Milton than in the Indian *Shasta*. The latter does not carry matters to so extravagant a pitch, as to make the angels who were the creatures of God declare war against their maker, or to render the victory for sometime doubtful.

We are indebted for our account of the *Shasta* chiefly to Mr. Holwell, who passed thirty years among the Brachmans, and understands perfectly well their language. V.

“ the

“ the end of time, had not envy entered into the
 “ breast of *Moisaor* and the angels his followers.
 “ They rejected the state of perfection with which
 “ the Eternal had endued them in his goodness.
 “ They committed evil in his sight. The faithful
 “ angels were seized with grief, and sorrow was
 “ known for the first time in heaven.”

After this we find the rebellion of the wicked angels described. The three ministers of God, from whom Plato perhaps took the notion of a Trinity, are said to have precipitated the rebellious spirits into the abyfs. After a time they are pardoned by the Eternal and sent to animate the bodies of men.

In all antiquity we meet with nothing so majestic or philosophical as this. These mysteries of the Brachmans penetrated even as far as Syria. They must necessarily have been well known, since the Jews heard them spoken of in the time of Herod. About that period these principles of the Brachmans were introduced into a spurious book, entitled *Henoc*, which has been quoted by the Apostle Jude, and in which something is said of the fall of the angels. This doctrine became afterwards the foundation of the Christian religion.

The human mind has degenerated in India. This is probably an effect of the Tartar government. The same thing has happened in Greece and Egypt, since the Turks have been masters of those countries. The sciences have been almost wholly extinguished in the same manner in Persia, by the revolutions of the state. We have observed, that they continued fixed in China at the same point of mediocrity, at which they were with us in the middle ages, and this will be found to be from the same cause, namely, a superstitious respect for antiquity, and the regulations of the schools. Thus, in every country the human understanding meets with obstacles to retard its progress. It is certain however, that in the 13th century of our æra, the true spirit of philosophy was not altogether extinct in India. Pachimerus, in that age, translated the writings of a Brachman his co-

temporary. We shall here give a passage from one of them which well merits attention.

“ I have seen all sects reciprocally accusing one another of imposture. I have seen all the Magi furiously disputing about the first principle and the last end. I have questioned them all ; and among all those heads of faction, I found nothing but an inflexible obstinacy, a supercilious contempt, and an implacable aversion against one another. I resolved therefore to believe none of them. These doctors, in seeking the truth, are like a woman that wants to introduce her lover by a back door, but cannot find the key. Mankind in their idle researches, resemble a person who climbs up a tree, where there is a little honey, and scarce has he eaten of it, when the serpents that are about the tree, devour him.”

Such was the manner of writing among the Indians. Their spirit appears still more in the diversions which they invented. The game, which the French by corruption call *des échecs* (chess) is of their invention, and we know nothing that is equal to it : it is allegorical like their fables, and an image of war. The names of *Shak* (Check) which signifies *King*, and of *Pion*, (Pawn) which signifies *soldier*, are still retained in that part of the East. The figures we make use of in arithmetic, and which the Arabians brought into Europe about the time of Charlemagne, came from India. The ancient medals which are so highly prized by the curious among the Chinese, are a proof that many of the arts were cultivated in India before they were known in China.

The annual course of the sun has from time immemorial been divided, in India, into twelve parts. The year of the Brachmans, and most antient Gymnosophists, always began when the sun entered the constellation, which they call *Moscham*, and we the Ram. Their weeks always consisted of seven days : a division never known to the Greeks. Their days

bear the names of the seven planets. Sunday was by them called Mitradinam ; but it is uncertain whether this word Mitra, which among the Persians also signifies the sun, belonged originally to the language of the Magi, or to that of the sages of India.

It is very difficult to discover which of the two nations taught the other ; but if it was necessary to decide this point between the Egyptians and Indians, I should imagine that the sciences were much more ancient in the Indies ; and my conjecture is founded on the country of India being more easily inhabited than the land adjoining to the Nile, whose inundations must for a long time have discouraged the first colonies, before they brought the river into subjection by digging canals. Besides, the soil of India being much more various in its fertility, was better adapted to excite the curiosity and industry of mankind.

Some have imagined that the human race came originally from Indostan, alledging that the weakest animal must have been produced in the mildest climate : and in a country where the earth spontaneously produces the most wholesome and nourishing fruits, such as dates and cocoas, the latter of which in particular afford men with very little trouble, not only food, but also raiment and lodging. And what other wants can the inhabitants of this peninsula experience ? The labourer, in that country, works almost naked ; and two ells, at the most, of linen, are a sufficient covering for a woman who is a stranger to luxury. The children continue naked from the moment of their birth to the age of puberty. Those mattresses, those heaps of feathers, those double curtains, which are so much the objects of pains and expence among us, would be intolerable inconveniences to these people, who can sleep only upon the slightest mat, and with a free circulation of air. Those houses of carnage, which we call butcheries, where so many carcases are sold to nourish our own, would occasion a pestilence in the climate of India.

The

The inhabitants of that country require only a pure and refreshing food, and nature has accordingly bestowed on them, with a liberal hand, forests of citron, orange, fig, palm, and cocoa trees, and fields covered with rice. The most robust labourer among them cannot expend more than one or two pence a day for his diet. One of our workmen spends more in a single day than a Malabar would do in a month. All these considerations seem to corroborate the ancient opinion, that man is a native of that country where nature has provided for all his wants and left him little to do himself. But this only proves that the Indians themselves were in the beginning placed in the climate they are now in, and not that the several other races of men came from the same country. The whites, the negroes, the reds, the Laplanders, the Samojedes, and the Albinos or white Moors, are certainly not all of them natives of one and the same soil. The difference between all these several kinds of men being as distinctly marked as it is between the horse and the camel, no one therefore but an obstinate ignorant Bramin would attempt to assert that the whole human race is descended from a single Indian and his wife.

In the time of Charlemagne India was known only by name, and the Indians were ignorant that there was a Charlemagne. The Arabians, sole masters of the maritime commerce, supplied both Constantinople and the Franks with the commodities of the Indies. The Venetians bought them up at Alexandria. The demand for them in France among private people was not yet very considerable: they were long unknown in Germany and throughout the North. The Romans had carried on this trade themselves as soon as they were masters of Egypt. Thus the western nations have always carried their gold and silver to India, and enriched that country, which is so rich of itself. Hence it happens that we never see the inhabitants of India, China, or the borders of the
Ganges,

Ganges, quit their own country to make incursions into our countries, as was the custom with the Arabians, both Jews and Saracens, the Tartars, and even the Romans, who being situated in the worst part of all Italy, subsisted formerly wholly by war, as they do now by religion.

It is indisputable that the continent of India was of a much greater extent formerly than it is at present. The immense number of islands which lie near it towards the East and South were, in the early ages of the world, a part of the continent. Proofs of this are still to be perceived in the extreme shallowness of the sea which separates them from the terra firma; in the trees that grow at its bottom, and which resemble those found on the islands; and lastly, in the new portions of land which it frequently leaves dry: all which tends to shew that this part of the continent has been formerly overflowed, and this must have insensibly happened when the ocean, which always gains in one part what it loses in another, retired from our western shores.

India having been in all ages a trading industrious nation, its civil polity must have been excellent; and that country to which Pythagoras had travelled for instruction, must have been governed by good laws, without which the arts are never cultivated. But mankind with good laws have ever been subject to foolish customs: that which made it a point of honour and religion for women to burn themselves upon the dead bodies of their husbands, subsisted in India from time immemorial, and is not yet abolished. Indian philosophers have flung themselves upon a funeral pile, through an excess of fanaticism and vain glory. Calanus,* who burnt himself to death in the presence

* An Indian philosopher, who, at the age of 83, according to Curtius, followed Alexander in his expedition, and being seized with a violent colic took the resolution to burn himself. T.

of Alexander, was not the first to set this example. In the year 1735 the widow of the King of Tanjour burned herself in this manner upon the funeral pile of her husband. Mr. Dupleix, Governor of Pondicherry, and Mr. Dumas, have been eye-witnesses to other spectacles of the same kind. This is certainly the ultimate effort of the errors which pervert the human race. The most austere Dervise will appear to be pusillanimous when compared with a Malabar woman. One would have supposed that a nation, in which both philosophers and women devoted themselves voluntarily to death, must have been warlike and invincible; yet ever since the ancient Sezac, every invader of India hath easily conquered that country.

It would be difficult to reconcile the sublime ideas, which the Bramins preserve of the Supreme Being, with their superstitions and fabulous mythology, did not history furnish us with the like contradictions among the Greeks and Romans. More than an hundred years ago there were Christians established on the coast of Malabar, in the midst of those idolatrous nations. A merchant of Syria, whose name was Mark Thomas, having settled on the Malabar coast with his family and his factors, in the sixth century, left there his religion, which was Nestorianism*. These eastern sectaries multiplied, and called themselves the Christians of St. Thomas; they lived peaceably among the idolaters. They who make no stir, are seldom persecuted. These Christians had no knowledge of the Latin church.

It was certainly not Christianity that flourished at that time in India; it was Mahometanism, which had been introduced there by the conquests of the Caliphs and Aaron al Rachild, the illustrious cotemporary of

* So called from Nestorius a Greek monk, who lived in the 5th century, and maintained that there were two persons in Christ as well as two natures. T.

Charlemagne.

Charlemagne. This prince, who conquered Africa, Syria, Persia, and a part of India, deputed some Mussulmen missionaries from the borders of the Ganges to the islands in the Indian sea, and even to several colonies of negroes. From that time there have been a great number of Mussulmen in India.

We are not told that the great Aaron converted the Indians by fire and sword as Charlemagne did the Saxons; neither do we find that the Indians refused to submit to the yoke of Aaron al Raschild, as the Saxons did to that of Charlemagne.

The Indians have always been as remarkable for the mildness, as our northern race have for the roughness of their manners. The effeminacy which is inspired by a climate is not to be overcome, but roughness is to be softened.

In general, the men inhabiting the south-east part of the globe, have received from nature gentler manners than the people of this western hemisphere. Their climate naturally disposes them to abstinence from strong liquors and flesh meats, foods which inflame the blood, and frequently excite a ferocity of temper; and although the general goodness of their dispositions may have been corrupted by superstition, and the repeated irruptions of foreigners, yet all travellers agree that these people have nothing of that petulance and sourness in their nature, which has cost so much pains to keep under in the people of the North.

There being so great a physical difference between us and the natives of India, there must undoubtedly have been as great a moral one. Their vices were in general less violent than ours. Like us they have in vain sought for a remedy against the irregularity of their manners. From time immemorial it was a maxim with them and the Chinese that the wise man was to come from the West; whereas in Europe, on the contrary, we have been taught to expect him from the

AN ESSAY ON THE MANNERS

East. The truth is, that from the beginning of time all nations have stood in need of a wise man.

C H A P. IV.

Of the Brachmans; and of the Vedam and Ezourvedam.

IF India, from which all the other nations of the world supply their wants, while she alone is in want of nothing, must for this very reason have been the most early civilized of any country, she must consequently have had the most early form of worship. It is very probable that this religion was for a long time the same with that of the Chinese government, and consisted only in the pure and simple worship of a Supreme Being, free from any superstition or fanaticism.

The first Brachmans founded this simple religion, in the same manner as it had been established in China by the first kings of that country. These Brachmans were the governors of India. When the peaceable rulers of a mild and discerning people, are at the head of a religion, it must necessarily be simple and rational, because its chiefs have no occasion for errors to procure them obedience. It is so natural to believe in one only God, and to adore him, and to feel from the very soul that he must be just, that where a ruler declares these truths, the faith of the people renders as it were his precepts superfluous. It requires some time to establish arbitrary laws, but a single instant is sufficient to teach a number of people assembled, to believe that there is a God, and to hearken to the dictates of their own hearts.

The first Brachmans therefore, being at once Kings and Pontiffs, could not establish religion but on the foundation of universal reason; the case is not the same however in those countries, in which the dignity

nity of Pontiff is not united with royalty. In this case the religious functions, which originally belonged to the heads of families, form a distinct profession. The service of God becomes a trade, and to render this trade lucrative, recourse must sometimes be had to delusions and impostures.

Religion then degenerated among the Brachmans as soon as they ceased to be sovereigns.

The Brachmans had ceased to rule in India long before the time of Alexander the Great; but their tribe, or *cast*, as it was called, still held the chief rank, as it continues to do to this day; and it was from this tribe that they took those sages (true and false) which the Greeks called Gymnosophists. It cannot be denied, that, even in their decline, they gave many proofs of that kind of virtue, which is compatible with the illusions of fanaticism. They continued to acknowledge one supreme God, in the midst of the multitude of subordinate deities, which popular superstition adopted in all countries in the world. Strabo expressly says, that in the main the Brachmans acknowledge only one God. In this they resembled Confucius, Orpheus, Socrates, Plato, Marcus Aurelius, Epictetus, and all the sages and hierophantes, or those who had the care of the sacred mysteries. The seven years of novitiate among the Brachmans, and the silence enjoined during that term, were still in force in the time of Strabo. The celibacy to be observed during this probation, the abstaining from the flesh of household animals, were laws which they never transgressed, and which still subsist among them. They believed in one God, the creator, preserver and avenger of mankind, and likewise admitted the fall and degeneracy of man, an idea which is every where to be met with among the people of antiquity. *Aurea prima fata est ætas* is the device of all nations.

Apuleius, Quintus Curtius, Clement of Alexandria, Philostratus, Porphyry, and Palladio, all agree

in the praises they bestow on the frugality of the Brachmans, their life of retirement and penance, their voluntary poverty, and the contempt they shew for all the vanities of this world. St. Ambrose in the most open terms, prefers their manners to those of the christians of his time; though perhaps this might be one of those allowable exaggerations, in which we sometimes indulge ourselves, when our aim is to correct the irregularities of our fellow citizens. A panegyric on the Brachmans, is very often intended as a salutary satire on the monks; and had St. Ambrose lived in India, he would probably have praised the monks, in order to put the Brachmans to the blush. It is certain however from a variety of testimonies, that these men were every where in high reputation, on account of the sanctity of their lives.

The belief of one only God, for which they were so esteemed by all the philosophers, they still continue to preserve in the midst of their pagodas, and the extravagant superstition of the people.

One of our French poets says in one of his epistles, which by the bye abound with falsehoods,

L'Inde aujourd'hui voit l'orgueilleux Bracmane,
Deifier, brutalement zélé,
Le diable même en bronze ciselé.

— now India sees

The Brachman bow before the brazen shrine,
And even to Satan yield the rites divine
With brutal zeal.——

But certainly men who do not believe in a devil, can hardly invoke that devil. Such absurd reproaches are intolerable. The devil was never adored in any country. The Manichæans themselves never paid any worship to the evil spirit, nor is it any where enjoined in the religion of Zoroaster. It is high time
for

for us to lay aside the mean custom of calumniating all sects, and abusing all nations but our own.

We have, as you know, the *Ezour-vedam*, an ancient commentary, composed by Chumontou on the *Vedam*, that holy book, which the Brachmans pretend to have been delivered by God himself to mankind. This commentary has been digested by a very learned Brachman, who has done many great services to our India company, and who translated it himself out of the holy tongue into French*.

In this *Ezour-vedam*, or commentary, Chumontou strongly attacks idolatry. He first quotes the words of the *Vedam* itself.

“ The Supreme Being has created all things,
 “ both animate and inanimate. There have been
 “ four different ages in the world: every thing perished, the whole world was overflowed at the end
 “ of each age, and a deluge is the passage from
 “ one age to another, &c.

“ When God existed alone, and no other being
 “ existed with him, he formed the design of creating
 “ the world. He at first created time, and then the
 “ water and the earth, and from the mixture of the
 “ five elements, namely, earth, water, fire, air and
 “ light, he formed the different bodies, and gave
 “ them the earth as their basis. He made this globe
 “ which we inhabit, oval like an egg. In the midst
 “ of the earth is the highest of all mountains, named
 “ Merou (i. e. *Immaus*.) *Adimo* was the name of
 “ the first man created by the hands of God, his
 “ wife’s name was *Procriti*. Of *Adimo* was born
 “ *Brama*, who was the lawgiver of nations, and the
 “ father of the Bramins.”

How many curious things are here in a few words! the first that presents itself to us is this important

* This MS. is in the King’s library, where any one may consult it. V.

truth, that God is the creator of the world : then follows the primitive source of the old fable of the four ages, the golden, the silver, the brazen, and the iron. All the principles of ancient theology are included in the Vedam. We there find the Deucalidonian deluge, which is only an emblem of the prodigious trouble, that men found in those times to drain the ground, which the negligence of their predecessors had suffered to lie under water. All the other passages of the Vedam, quoted in this manuscript are surprising. We there find the following admirable sentence word for word :

“ God never created sin, nor can he be the author thereof. God, who is wisdom and holiness, created only virtue.”

The following is one of the most singular passages in the Vedam :

“ When the first man came from the hand of God, he said to him, There will be different occupations on the earth ; every man will not be fit to exercise all, how then are we to distinguish such as are proper for each ? God answered him, They who are born with more genius, and a greater inclination for virtue than the rest shall be Brachmans. They who partake the most of *rosogoun*, or ambition, shall be warriors ; they who partake the most of *tomogun*, or avarice, shall be merchants ; and they who partake the most of *comogun*, that is, who are robust and of a limited understanding, shall be employed in servile labours.”

He may discover the true original of the *four casts* in India, or rather of the four conditions of human society ; for indeed, on what can the inequality of these conditions be founded, but on the primitive inequality of talents ? The Vedam goes on and says,

“ The Supreme Being has neither body nor figure ;” and the Ezour-vedam adds, “ All such who give the Deity hands or feet, are madmen.”

Chumontou then quotes these words of the Vedam :

“ When

“ When God drew all things from nothing,
 “ he created a distinct individual of each species,
 “ and willed that it should contain its own germ
 “ within itself, in order to produce its like. He is
 “ the principle of all things. The sun is but an in-
 “ sensible and inanimate substance, and is, in the
 “ hands of God, like a candle in the hands of a
 “ man.”

After this, the author of the commentary, as he is attacking the opinion of the modern Bramins*, who admit several incarnations in the god *Brama* and the god *Witfnou*, expresses himself thus :

“ Tell me, blind and incoherent man, who were
 “ this *Kochiopo* and this *Odite*, of whom thou sayest
 “ thy god was born ? Were they not mortals like
 “ us ? Shall then that God, who is pure in his na-
 “ ture, and eternal in his essence, stoop to lose
 “ himself in the embraces of a woman, in order to
 “ take a human shape ? Dost thou not blush to re-
 “ present that God to us, in the posture of a sup-
 “ pliant before one of his creatures ? Hast thou lost
 “ thy understanding ? Or, art thou come to that
 “ height of impiety, as not to blush at making the
 “ Divine Being act the part of an impostor and a
 “ liar ?——Cease then to deceive mankind ; and on
 “ this condition, and this only, I will explain to
 “ thee the *Vedam* ; for if thou remainest in the same
 “ sentiments, thou art incapable of understanding
 “ it, and it would be profanation to attempt to teach
 “ it thee.”

In the third book of this commentary, Chumontou refutes the fable of the incarnation of the god *Brama*, invented by the modern Bramins, who pretend he appeared in India, under the name of *Kopilo*, that is to say, the penitent, and that he chose to be born of *Debobuti*, the wife of a man in good circumstances, whose name was *Kordomo*.

* M. de Voltaire uses the words Brachman and Bramin, indiscriminately. T.

“ If

“ If it is true, says the commentator, that Brama
 “ was born upon earth, how came he to bear the
 “ name of Eternal? Would he, who is supremely
 “ happy, and in whom alone is our happiness, have
 “ submitted to all that an infant must suffer? &c.”

After this we meet with a description of hell, altogether similar to that which the Egyptians and Greeks have since given us of Tartarus. “ What
 “ must we do, it then says, to avoid hell?” “ We
 “ must love God, replies the commentator Chomon-
 “ tou; we must do what is ordered in the Vedam,
 “ and in the manner there prescribed. There are,
 “ says he, four ways of loving God. The first is,
 “ to love him for his own sake, and without any
 “ self-view; the second is, to love him through in-
 “ terest; the third is, to love him only in those mo-
 “ ments when we listen not to our passions: and the
 “ fourth is, to love him only for the sake of obtain-
 “ ing the object of those passions; and this last way
 “ does not deserve the name of love.”

This is the summary of the most remarkable passages in the *Vedam*, a book hitherto unknown in Europe, and to almost all Asia.

The Bramins have degenerated more and more. The *Cormoredam*, which is their ritual, is a collection of superstitious ceremonies, which would make any one laugh who is not born on the borders of the Ganges or Indies; or, in other words, any one, who not being a philosopher, is surprised at the follies of other nations, and not at those of his own country.

The detail of every trifling circumstance would be immense. The whole is a collection of all the follies, wherewith the study of judicial astrology can have inspired the brains of an ingenious but extravagant, or designing body of learned men. The whole life of a Bramin is employed in these superstitious ceremonies. They have one for every day of the year. It would seem as if mankind had become weak and effeminate in India, in proportion as they have been subjected.

subjected. There is great appearance, that after each conquest the superstitions and the penances of these people have been increased. Sezac, Madies, the Affyrians, the Persians, Alexander, the Arabians, the Tartars, and in our own days Sha Nadir, by their successive incursions and ravages in this beautiful country, have formed a nation of devotees, of those whom Nature had not formed for war.

Their pagods were never so rich as in times of the greatest humiliation and misery. Each of these pagods has a considerable revenue belonging to it, which is farther increased by the offerings of the devout. When a Raja passes by a pagod, he immediately alights from his horse, his camel, his elephant, or his palanquin, and walks on foot till he is out of the district of that pagod.

The ancient commentary on the Vedam, from which I have given the above extracts, seems to me to have been written before the time of Alexander's conquests in India, for we meet with none of those names which the Greek conquerors gave to the rivers, towns, and provinces of that country. India itself is called *Zomboudipo*; mount Immaus, *Merou*; and the Ganges, *Zenoubi*. These ancient names are at present known only to those learned in the holy language.

The ancient purity of the religion of the first Brachmans subsists no longer, except among a few of their philosophers, and these do not give themselves the trouble of instructing a people who will not receive instruction, and who indeed deserve it not. They would even run some hazard in attempting to undeceive them; the ignorant Bramins would give the alarm, and the women, who are attached to their pagods and little superstitious ceremonies, would join in the cry of impiety. Whoever attempts to teach his fellow-citizens reason, is sure of being persecuted for his pains, unless he is of the more powerful side; and it almost always happens, that he who

H

is

is armed with power, rivets the chains of ignorance instead of breaking them.

The Mahometan religion alone has made an immense progress in India, especially among the higher rank of people: and this seems to be, because it is the religion of the sovereign, and that it teaches the worship of only one God, conforming in this to the ancient doctrine of the Brachmans. (The success of Christianity in India has been by no means the same, notwithstanding the evidence and holiness of its doctrines, and the numerous settlements of the Portuguese, French, English, Dutch, and Danes: and indeed this mixture of nations may have been the chief hindrance to the progress of our holy faith: for as they all hate each other, and are frequently at war between themselves in this country, it has made the doctrine they teach despised. Moreover, the Indians are disgusted with our customs, and scandalized to see us drink wine, and eat flesh-meats, which they hold in abhorrence. The conformation of our organs of speech, which occasions us to pronounce the Asiatic languages so badly, is another almost insurmountable obstacle; but the greatest is the difference of opinions which divide our missionaries. The Catholics oppose those who are of the Church of England, and these are incessantly attacking the Lutherans, who are again opposed by the Calvinists. In this manner every one contradicting another, and all pretending to publish the voice of truth, and mutually charging each other with falsehood, confound a simple and peaceable people, who see crowding into their country from the western extremities of the earth, a set of men eager to destroy each other on the borders of the Ganges.)

We have had indeed in that, as well as in other parts of the world, some missionaries who were respectable by their piety, and who could not be accused of having exaggerated their labours or their success.

But

in answer

But they have not all been men of understanding and virtue, who have been sent from Europe to make converts in Asia. The celebrated Niecamp, author of the History of the Tranquebar Mission, acknowledges *, "That the Portuguese filled the seminary of Goa with malefactors who had been condemned to banishment; that of these they made missionaries, and that these missionaries could not forget their old trade." Our holy religion has made very little progress in these countries, and none at all in the dominions immediately subject to the Great Mogul. The religion of Mahomet and that of Brahma continue to divide the vast continent between them. It is not yet two centuries ago, since we used to give all those nations the name of Pagans, while at the same time the Arabians, the Turks, and the Indians considered us only in the light of idolaters.

C H A P. V.

Of Persia, in the Time of the Prophet Mahomet; and of the ancient Religion of Zoroaster.

IN turning towards Persia, we find a little before the time, which serves me as an æra, the greatest and most sudden revolution that was ever known upon earth.

A new empire, a religion and manners hitherto unknown, had changed the face of these countries; and this change had already extended a great way into Asia, Africa and Europe.

In order to obtain an idea of Mahometanism, which has given a new form to so many empires, I shall begin with taking a view of the parts of the world that first submitted to it.

* Vol. I. page 223.

Persia had, before Alexander's time, extended its dominion from Egypt to Bactriana, beyond the country where now is situated Samarcand, and from Thrace to the river Indus.

It was indeed divided and limited under the Seleucidæ*, it gained new additions under Arsaces the Parthian, two hundred and fifty years before Christ. The Arsacidæ possessed neither Syria, nor the countries bordering on the Euxine sea, but they disputed with the Romans the empire of the East, and the obstacles they opposed to them were always insurmountable.

In the time of Alexander Severus, about the year 226 of our æra, a Persian common soldier, who took the name of Artaxerxes, wrested this kingdom from the Parthians, and re-established the Persian empire, whose extent was then nearly the same as it is at present.

You are not disposed to examine in this place, who were the first Babylonians subdued by the Persians, nor why these people should boast of astronomical observations for four hundred thousand years, of which no more than a series of nineteen hundred years could be found in the time of Alexander. Neither are you inclined to digress from your subject, to revive the ideas of the grandeur of Babylon, and of those monuments, which are much more extolled than they deserved to be, and of which the very ruins are destroyed. If any remains of the Asiatic arts merit our curiosity, it is the ruins of Persepolis, described in a variety of books, and copied in several prints. I am no stranger to the admiration inspired by those ruins, that escaped the torches with which Alexander and the courtesan Thais, set Perse-

* A name given to the descendants of Seleucus, who was one of Alexander's generals, and after the death of his master became King of Syria. T.

polis in flames. But could a palace erected at the foot of a chain of barren rocks be a master-piece of art? The columns which are yet standing cannot surely be reckoned either of a just proportion or of an elegant design. The capitals, loaded with foolish ornaments, are nearly as high as the shaft. All the figures are as heavy and uncouth, as those which unluckily disgrace our Gothic churches. They are monuments of grandeur but not of taste; and the whole serves only to confirm us in the opinion, that if we confine ourselves to the history of the polite arts, we shall find only four ages in the annals of the world, namely, those of Alexander, of Augustus, of the Medicis, and of Lewis XIV.

The Persians however were always an ingenious people. Lokman, who is the same as Æsop, was born at Casbin. This tradition is far more probable than that which makes him a native of Ethiopia, a country that never produced philosophers. The dogmas of the ancient Zerdust, called Zoroaster by the Greeks, who have changed all the oriental names, still subsisted. This doctrine is said to be nine thousand years old; for the Persians, as well as the Egyptians, Indians, and Chinese, throw back the origin of the world as much as the other nations bring it forward. A second Zoroaster, under Darius the son of Hytaspes, had only improved this ancient religion. It is in these dogmas that we find, as in India, the earliest notions of the immortality of the soul, and a future state of happiness or misery. There likewise we see an express mention of hell. Zoroaster in the writings collected in the *Sadder*, pretends that God gave him a sight of this hell, and of the punishments reserved for the wicked. He tells us he saw several kings there, and among the rest one who had only one foot. He asked God the reason, and God answered him: *This perverse king did but one good action in his whole life. As he was hunting one day, he saw a dromedary tied so far from his trough, that*
though

though he wanted to eat he could not reach it. He kicked the trough nearer with his foot; I placed that foot in heaven; all the rest is here. This passage, which is but little known, shews the kind of philosophy that prevailed in those distant ages, a philosophy always allegorical, and sometimes extremely profound.

You well know that the Babylonians were the first, after the Indians, who admitted intermediate beings between the Deity and man. The Jews gave no names to angels till the time of their captivity in Babylon.

The first appearance we see of the word *Satan* is in the book of Job. It is a Persian word, and it has been asserted that Job himself was of that country. The name of *Raphael* is employed by the author of Tobias, who it seems was captive at Nineveh, and wrote in Chaldaic. Even the word *Israel* was Chaldaic, and signified *seeing God*. The *Sadder* is an abridgment of the *Zenda vesta* or *Zend*, one of the three most ancient books we have in the world. The word *Zenda* among the Chaldeans implied the cultivation of fire. The *Sadder* is divided into an hundred articles, to which the Orientals give the names of *gates* or *powers*. It is necessary for us to be acquainted with them, if we wish to inform ourselves of the morality of the ancient nations of the world. Our ignorant credulity is incessantly figuring to itself that we have invented every thing; that every thing came from the Jews, and that we succeeded to that people. We find ourselves egregiously mistaken in these points when we dive a little into antiquity. Here are some of those articles of the *Sadder* we have just now spoken of, and which will serve to undeceive us.

I. The decree of the most just God is, that men shall be judged by the good or evil they have committed. Their actions shall be weighed in the scales of equity.

The good shall inhabit the light, and be delivered from Satan.

II. If thy virtues are in greater abundance than thy sins, heaven shall be thy portion. If thy sins are in the greater number, hell shall be thy punishment.

V. He who gives alms is truly a man; it is the greatest merit of our holy religion.

VI. Celebrate the Sun four times a day; celebrate the Moon at the beginning of the month.

N. B. It does not say, adore the sun and moon as gods, but celebrate the sun and moon as works of the Creator. The ancient Persians were not worshippers of fire, but of the divinity, as the writer of the history of the Persian religion has proved beyond a doubt.

VII. Say *Abunavar* and *Asbim Vuhû* when any one sneezes.

N. B. This article is quoted only to prove how very ancient is the custom of saluting those who sneeze.

IX. Avoid, above all, the sin against nature, for there is none greater than this.

N. B. This precept makes it appear how much Sextus Empiricus was mistaken, when he asserted that this infamy was tolerated by the laws of Persia.

XI. Be careful to keep up the sacred fire; it is the soul of the world.

N. B. This sacred fire became a religious rite with several nations.

XII. Do not bury the dead in new cloth, &c.

N. B. This precept shews how much those authors were mistaken, who have asserted that the Persians were never accustomed to bury their dead.

The

56 AN ESSAY ON THE MANNERS

The custom of interring or of burning dead bodies, or of exposing them to the air on the tops of hills, has often varied. These rites have experienced changes in every country: it is in morality alone there has been no change.

XIII. Love thy father and thy mother if thou meanest to live for ever.

N. B. See the ten commandments.

XV. When any thing is presented to thee, bless God.

XIX. Marry in thy youth; this world is only a passage: it is ordained that thy son shall follow thee, and that the chain of beings shall be uninterrupted.

XXX. It is certain that God said unto Zoroaster, "When thou shalt be in doubt whether an action is good or evil, do not commit it."

N. B. This principle is a little repugnant to the doctrine of probable opinions.

XXXIII. Let the hand of liberality be extended only to the worthy; that which is given to the unworthy is lost.

XXXV. But if there be question of what is necessary, when thou eatest thyself, give likewise to the dogs to eat.

XL. Whoever undertakes to exhort men to penitence, ought to be without sin, and inspired with true zeal. He ought not to be given to deceit; his disposition should be mild, and his soul sensible to friendship; his heart and his tongue ought always to agree with each other; he should be far removed from debauchery and injustice, and should hold himself forth as a pattern of goodness and justice before the people of God.

N. B. What a lesson is this for the priests of every country! It is remarkable, that in all the

the religions of the East, the people are called the people of God.

XLI. When the *Fervadagans* are at hand, indulge in feasts of expiation and benevolence, for this is agreeable to the Creator.

N. B. This precept has some resemblance to the Agapes.*

LXVII. Never tell an untruth, for it is infamous, although it may be useful.

LXIX. Neither indulge thyself in familiarities with courtesans, nor endeavour to seduce another man's wife.

LXX. Abstain from theft of every kind.

LXXI. Let thy hand, thy tongue, and thy thoughts be free from sin. In thy afflictions offer up thy patience to God; and in thy happier days return him thanks.

XCI. Night and day let thy thoughts be employed in doing good, for life is short. If, instead of serving thy neighbour to-day, thou puttest it off till to-morrow, do penance. Celebrate the six Gahambars, for God created the world in six times in the space of a year. During the six Gahambars refuse no one's request. It was on one of these days that the great King Giemshid directed his chief purveyor to entertain all comers. The evil genius, or Satan, presented himself under the form of a traveller, and when he had ate what was set before him, asked for more; Giemshid ordered a bullock to be served up to him.—Satan having devoured this also, Giemshid directed his horses to be dressed and set before him; Satan however still called out for more. The just God then sent the angel Behman, who drove

* The Agapes, or love feasts, were in use among the primitive Christians. T.

away the Devil; but this action of Giemshid] was agreeable to the Deity.

N.B. We may clearly distinguish the oriental genius in this allegory.

These were the principal dogmas of the ancient Persians. Almost all of them are conformable to the natural religions of all the other nations of the earth. Religious ceremonies are indeed different in every country, but virtue is every where the same; and the reason is, because the latter is derived from God, whereas the former are of human institution.

We shall content ourselves with observing that the Persians had always a baptism, though they never adopted circumcision. Baptism was common to all the ancient nations of the East: the circumcision introduced among the Egyptians, Arabians, and Jews is of infinitely later date. There is indeed nothing more natural than to wash one's self; but many ages must necessarily have passed away before men could be led to imagine that an operation, repugnant both to nature and decency, could be pleasing in the eye of the Supreme Being.

We pass over every thing that relates to ceremonies which to us appear useless, and even ridiculous, because they were connected with customs to which we are strangers. We likewise suppress those incoherent and figurative descriptions which were so familiar to all the oriental writers, amongst whom the author of the fables attributed to Æsop was perhaps the only one who wrote in a natural manner.

It is certain that good taste was never known in the East; and this was because the men in those countries having never lived in society with the women, and having almost always been accustomed to retirement, had not the same opportunities of improving the understanding that the Greeks and Romans had. If you deprive the Arabians, the Persians, and the Jews of the sun and the moon, of their
mountains

mountains and valleys, of their dragons and basilisks, you at once take from them all their poetry.

It is sufficient for our purpose to know that these precepts of Zoroaster, related in the Sadder, are of the highest antiquity, and that they speak of kings of whom there is no mention made even by Berossus*.

We are unable to say who was the first Zoroaster, or at what period he flourished; nor can we determine whether he was the *Brama* of the Indians, and the *Abraham* of the Jews. We are certain however, beyond a doubt, that his religion taught virtue, which is the essential principle of all religions. They can indeed have no other; it not being in the nature of the human mind, however hardened it may be, to believe in any one who comes to propagate evil.

The dogmas of Sadder likewise prove to us that the Persians were not idolaters. Our ignorant temerity for a long time led us to accuse the Persians, the Indians, the Chinese, and even the Mahometans (who are so attached to the unity of God) of idolatry. These people consider us in the same light, not being sufficiently acquainted with our mysteries. All our old Italian, French, and Spanish books speak of the Mahometans as Pagans. We were in those days like the Chinese, who fancied themselves the only reasonable people in the world, and who denied even the human form to other men. Reason has always been late in coming: it is a divinity which has appeared only to a few.

The Jews have attributed the repast of Thyestes, and the nuptials of Oedipus, to the Christians; the Christians have ascribed the same things to the Pagans; all the different sects have mutually re-

* An ancient historian, who flourished about 286 years before Christ, and wrote three books on the affairs of the Chaldeans and Assyrians. T.

proached each other with the greatest crimes: the whole world has been traduced.

The doctrine of the two principles is derived from Zoroaster. Oromazes*, the ancient of days, and Arimanes the genius of darkness, were the original of Manicheism. This is the Osiris and the Typhon of the Egyptians; this likewise was the Pandora of the Greeks, and the vain efforts of all the sages to explain the origin of good and evil. This theology of the Magi was respected under all the governments of the East; and amidst all the revolutions, the ancient religion maintained itself in Persia. Neither the gods of the Greeks nor any other deities ever prevailed in that empire.

Noushirvan or Cosroes the Great, towards the close of the sixth century, extended his empire into a part of Arabia Petræa, and Arabia Felix. He drove out the Abyssinian Christians who had invaded those countries, and extirpated as much as he was able, Christianity from his dominions, being forced to this severity by the crime of his wife's son, who turning Christian revolted against him.

The children of the great Noushirvan, who were unworthy of such a father, laid Persia waste by their civil wars and parricides. The successors of the legislator Justinian degraded the name of Emperor: Maurice was dethroned by the arms of Phocas, and by the intrigues of the patriarch of Syria, in conjunction with some bishops, whom Phocas afterwards punished for having assisted him. The blood of Maurice and his five sons was spilt by the hands of the common executioner. Pope Gregory the Great, the enemy of the patriarchs of Constantinople, endeavoured to engage the tyrant Phocas to embrace his interest, by lavishing praises on him, and con-

* The Magi and Chaldeans gave the name of *Oromazes* to the Supreme Being, a word which in their language implies *burning light*. This was the good principle, but opposed to this was *Arimanes* or the evil spirit. T.

denning the memory of Maurice, whom he had flattered while living.

The Roman Empire in the West was destroyed, and a deluge of Barbarians, Goths, Heruli, Huns and Vandals had overflowed Europe; when Mahomet laid the foundations of the religion and power of the Mussulmen in the deserts of Arabia.

C H A P. VI.

Of Arabia and Mahomet.

OF all the conquerors and legislators, there is not one whose life has been written with greater authenticity or more circumstantial exactness by his cotemporaries, than that of Mahomet. If we divest it of those prodigies with which that part of the world has been always misled, the rest will be found to be perfectly agreeable to truth. He was born at Mecca, in Arabia Petræa, in the year 579 of our vulgar æra. His father's name was *Abdalah*, and his mother's *Emina*. There is no doubt that his family was one of the most considerable of the first tribe, which was that of Korah. But the genealogy which makes him to be descended in a right line from Abraham, appears to be one of those fables invented by the desire, which is so natural among men, of imposing upon one another.

The manners and superstitions of the first ages with which we are acquainted, were still preserved in Arabia. This appears by the vow which Abdalah Moutaleb, the grandfather of Mahomet, made to sacrifice one of his children. A priestess of Mecca, ordered him to redeem his son by offering a certain number of camels, which the exaggeration of the
Arabians

Arabians makes to amount to an hundred. This priestess was devoted to the service of a star, which is supposed to have been the dog-star, for each tribe had its particular star or planet*; they also paid divine honours to genii and demi-gods, but still acknowledged a superior Deity; and in this respect almost all nations have been agreed.

Abdalah Moutaleb is said to have lived an hundred and ten years; his son Mahomet carried arms when he was only fourteen years old, in a war upon the confines of Syria; but being afterwards reduced to very low circumstances, one of his uncles placed him as factor to a widow of the name of Cadishe, who carried on a considerable traffic in Syria; he was then about twenty-five years of age. The widow after a very short time espoused her factor, and Mahomet's uncle, who had brought about this match, gave his nephew twelve ounces of gold: so that a sum equivalent to about nine hundred livres† of our money, was the whole patrimony of him who was one day to change the face of the most extensive and most beautiful part of the globe. He lived an obscure life with his first wife Cadishe till he was forty years old. It was not till that time of life that he began to display those talents, which rendered him so superior to the rest of his countrymen. He possessed a lively and powerful eloquence, void of all art and method, such as seems to have been suited to the Arabians; to this he added an air of authority and insinuation, animated by piercing eyes and a happy disposition of features, together with a degree of intrepidity and liberality equal to Alexander's, and a sobriety which Alexander wanted in order to compleat his character of greatness.

* See the Koran, and the Preface to the Koran written by the learned and judicious *Sale*, who was five and twenty years in Arabia. V.

† Or 36l. sterling.

The love of women, which the warmth of his constitution rendered unavoidable, and which occasioned his having so many wives and concubines, did not weaken either his courage, his application, or his health. It is in this way that his cotemporaries speak of him, and their accounts are corroborated by his actions.

After having thoroughly informed himself of the character of his fellow-citizens, of their ignorance, credulity and disposition to enthusiasm, he found that it was possible for him to assume the character of a prophet. He determined within himself to begin by rooting out the doctrine of the Sabæans, which consisted in a mixed worship of the true God and of the stars; Judaism, which has been detested by every nation, and which was beginning to make a considerable progress in Arabia; and lastly, Christianity, which he knew only by the irregularities of several sects who were dispersed in different parts of his country. He pretended to revive the simple worship of *Abraham* or *Ibrahim*, from whom he claimed his descent, and to bring back men to a belief of one God, a dogma which he considered as degraded and mutilated in every religion. This is what he in effect expressly declares in the third *Sura*, or chapter of the Koran, where he says, "God knows, but ye know not. Abraham was neither Jew nor Christian, but of the true religion. His heart was resigned to God; he was not of the number of idolaters."

It is probable that Mahomet, like the generality of enthusiasts, being violently struck with his own ideas, uttered them at first in good faith, and gradually strengthening them by his reveries, deceived himself while he was deceiving others, and at length had recourse to imposture to support a doctrine which he believed to be well founded. He began by making himself believed in his own house, and this was probably his greatest difficulty. His wife and young

Ali, the husband of his daughter Fatima, were his first disciples.

His countrymen soon began to be incensed against him, but this was no more than what he had reason to suspect. His answer to the threats of the Korashites, shews at once his disposition and the mode of expression common to those of his nation. "Were you even to come against me, says he, with the sun at your right hand, and the moon at your left, I would not deviate from my purpose."

He had converted only sixteen disciples, four of whom were women, when he was obliged to make them quit Mecca, where they were persecuted; and sent them to preach his religion in Æthiopia. He himself ventured to remain at Mecca, where he braved all his enemies, and continued making new proselytes, whom he sent to Æthiopia to the number of an hundred. But that which served the most to strengthen his new religion, was the conversion of Omar, who, had long been his persecutor. This Omar, who was afterwards so great a conqueror, cried out in a numerous assembly, "I attest that there is but one God, and that he has neither companion nor equal, and that Mahomet is his servant and prophet."

His enemies were still however in greater number than his friends at Mecca; but his disciples having formed a considerable party at Medina, he at length fled thither, after having been persecuted and even condemned to death at Mecca. This flight, to which the name of *Hegira** has been given, became the æra of his glory and the foundation of his empire. From being a fugitive he rose to be a conqueror. He perhaps owed his success in a great measure to his being persecuted. Having taken refuge at Medina, he converted the inhabitants, and having drawn them over to his service, he began by defeating, with

* This happened in the year of Christ 622. T.

only an hundred and thirteen men, the people of Mecca who came to attack him with a thousand. This victory, which was considered as a miracle by his followers, led them to imagine that God fought for them as they did for him; and from this first victory they flattered themselves with the hopes of conquering the world. Mahomet took Mecca, saw his persecutors at his feet; and within the space of nine years conquered, by preaching and the force of arms, all Arabia, a country as extensive as Persia, and which neither the Persians nor Romans were ever able to subdue. He found himself at the head of forty thousand men intoxicated with enthusiasm.

He was no sooner successful than he wrote to Cosroes the Second, King of Persia, to the Emperor Heraclius, to the Prince of the Copts, Governor of Egypt, to the King of Abyssinia, and to a Prince whose name was Mondar, who reigned in a province near the Persian gulph.

He had the boldness to make them the proposal of embracing his religion; and what appears strange is, that two of these Princes actually became Mahometans; these were the King of Abyssinia and this Mondar. Cosroes tore Mahomet's letter with indignation; Heraclius answered him by making him presents; and the Prince of the Copts sent him a girl esteemed the master-piece of nature, who was called the beautiful Maria.

At the end of nine years, Mahomet thinking himself strong enough to extend his conquests and religion among the Greeks and Persians, began by attacking Syria, which at that time was subject to Heraclius, and took some cities from him. That Emperor whose head was turned with metaphysical disputes in religion, and who had espoused the party of the Monothelites, received within the compass of a very short time, two very singular proposals; the one from Cosroes the Second, who had subdued him

K

long

long before, and the other from Mahomet. Cosroes insisted on Heraclius's embracing the religion of the Magi, and Mahomet, on his becoming a Mussulman*.

The new prophet left it to the choice of those whom he wanted to subdue, either to embrace his faith, or to pay a tribute. This tribute was regulated by the Koran at thirteen drachms of silver annually for every head of a family. So moderate a tax, proves that the people he conquered were poor. The tribute has since been increased. Of all the legislators who have founded religions, he is the only one that extended his by conquests. Other nations have spread their worship by fire and sword into foreign countries; but no other founder of a sect was ever a conqueror. This extraordinary privilege is, in the eye of the Mahometans, the strongest argument, that God himself was pleased to assist their prophet.

At length Mahomet, after having made himself master of Arabia, and formidable to all his neighbours, was seized with a mortal distemper at Medina, at the age of sixty three years and a half; when resolving to behave in his last moments like a hero and a man of integrity, he cried out, "Let him to whom I have done violence and injustice appear; I am now ready to make him reparation." On this a man stood up, and demanded the restitution of some money; Mahomet directed it to be given to him, and expired a short time after, considered as a great man even by those who knew him to be an impostor, and revered as a prophet by all the rest.

Mahomet was certainly not an illiterate person as some have pretended. He must, on the contrary, have been a man of great learning for one of his nation and the age he lived in, since we have some

* This name, which signifies a *true believer*, was given by Mahomet to those who embraced his religion. T.

medical aphorisms of his, and he corrected the Arabian calendar, as Cæsar did that of the Romans. It is true that he stiles himself a prophet not versed in letters; but a person may know how to write without arrogating to himself the character of a learned man. He was a poet; the last verses of almost all the chapters of the Koran are in rhyme, and the rest in measured prose. This poetical diction contributed not a little to render his book respectable. Poetry was in the highest esteem among the Arabians, and whenever there was a good poet in any particular tribe, the other tribes sent an embassy of congratulation to that which had produced an author, whom they looked upon as inspired, and considered as an useful member. They used to fix up the best pieces of poetry in the Temple of Mecca, and when the second chapter of the Koran was placed there, which begins in this manner: "We ought not to doubt; this is the knowledge of the just, and of those who believe in the mysteries, who pray at the proper times and who give with liberality, &c." The first poet in Mecca, named Abid, tore down his own verses which had been fixed up in the temple, admired Mahomet and became his follower. These are manners, customs and facts so different from any amongst us, that they cannot fail to prove to us how much the great picture of the universe is diversified, and how cautiously we ought to guard against the habit we have contracted of judging of every thing by our own customs.

Some of the Arabians, who were cotemporaries with Mahomet, wrote his life in the most circumstantial manner. All these accounts abound with the barbarous simplicity of those times, which are called heroic. His marriage contract with his first wife Cadigha, is expressed in these words: *Whereas Cadigha is in love with Mahomet, and Mahomet is also in love with her.* We find what victuals his wives dressed for

him; we are told the names of his fwords and of his horses. Above all we may observe a remarkable conformity between the manners of his people, and those of the ancient Hebrews (I speak here of their manners only) the same ardor to rush into battle in the name of the Lord, the same thirst for plunder, the same division of the spoils, and every thing relating to this great object.

But, considering here only human things, and abstracting the judgments of God and his unsearchable ways, how happened it that Mahomet and his successors, who began their conquests exactly as the Jews did, should have atchieved such great things, and that the Jews did so little? Was it not because the Mussulmen took particular care to subject the vanquished to their religion, either by force or persuasion? The Jews on the contrary seldom converted strangers to their faith. The Arabian Mussulmen incorporated among them other nations; the Jews always kept themselves a distinct people. In short, it would seem as if the courage of the Arabians was more enthusiastic, and their conduct more bold and generous. The Jews held all other nations in abhorrence, and were always afraid of being enslaved: whereas the Arabians aimed at becoming masters of every thing, and believed themselves destined to command.

Although these Ismaelites resembled the Jews in their enthusiasm and thirst of plunder, yet were they greatly superior to them in courage, greatness of soul and magnanimity. Their history, both true and fabulous, before the time of Mahomet, abounds with examples of friendship, similar to those invented by the Greeks in the fables of Pylades and Orestes, Theseus and Pirithoüs. The history of the Barmecides is one continued description of unexampled generosity, which elevates the soul. These instances characterize a nation. On the contrary, in all the annals of the Hebrew nation, we do not meet with a
single

single generous action. They were strangers to hospitality, liberality, and clemency. Their greatest happiness has always consisted in exercising the most rapacious usury towards strangers: and this spirit of usury, which is the principle of baseness, is so engrafted in their hearts, as to be the incessant object of the figures they employ in that kind of eloquence which is peculiar to themselves. They have gloried in laying waste, with fire and sword, the little villages of which they were able to get possession. They put to death all the old men and children, reserving only the young maidens who were marriageable. They assassinated their masters when they were in slavery, and were never disposed to mercy when they were conquerors; in a word, they have always been the enemies of the human kind. There are no marks of politeness or science, or of any improvement in the arts, to be met with among these atrocious nations: whereas the Arabians, after the second age of the Hegira, became the preceptors of Europe in the arts and sciences, although their tenets seem to be by no means favourable to the polite arts.

The last will of Mahomet was not executed. He had named Aly, who had married his daughter Fatima, to succeed him in the empire; but ambition, which triumphs over fanaticism itself, induced the chiefs of his army to chuse for Caliph, or vicar of the prophet, old Abubeker, his father-in-law, from the hope that they soon should divide the succession amongst themselves. Aly, in the mean while, continued in Arabia, waiting for an opportunity to signalize himself.

This division sowed the first seeds of the great schism which at present separates the two sects of Omar and Aly, the Sunni and the Chias, the Turks and the modern Persians.

Abubeker began by gathering together the scattered leaves of the Koran. The several chapters of this book were read in the presence of all the chiefs, written
either

either upon the leaves of the palm-tree or upon parchment, and in this manner its authenticity was invariably established. These people carried their superstitious respect for the Koran so far as to persuade themselves that the original was written in Heaven. The only doubt was, whether it was written from all eternity, or only in the time of Mahomet. The most devout declared themselves for eternity.

Abubeker, soon after, led his Mussulmen into Palestine, where he defeated the brother of Heraclius. He died a short time after, with the reputation of being the most generous of all mankind, having never taken to his own use more than about forty pence a day out of all the spoil that was divided; thus shewing how the contempt of little mercenary views is compatible with that ambition which great interests inspire.

Abubeker is esteemed by the Mahometans as a great man and a faithful Mussulman. He is one of the saints of the Koran. The Arabians have given us his last will couched in these terms: *In the name of the most merciful God, this is the will of Abubeker, made at a time when he was going out of this world into the next, at a time when even Infidels believe, when the impious cease to doubt, and when liars speak the truth.* This introduction seems to have been written with sincerity, and yet Abubeker, who was father-in-law to Mahomet, must have had a near view of that prophet; so that he was either deceived himself by Mahomet, or must have been an accomplice in an illustrious imposture, which he considered as necessary. His situation required him to impose upon the world, both in his life-time, and at the hour of his death.

Omar, who was elected after him, was one of the most rapid conquerors that ever desolated the earth. He first took Damascus, celebrated for the fertility of its territory, for the finest manufactures of steel in the universe, and for those silks that still bear its name. He drove the Greeks, who went under the
appellation

appellation of Romans, out of Syria and Phœnicia; and, after a long siege, he took by capitulation the city of Jerufalem, a city that had been possessed by strangers, who succeeded each other, ever since David wrested it from its ancient inhabitants: and what is well worthy of observation, he indulged the Jews and Christians, who inhabited Jerufalem, with full liberty of conscience.

The lieutenants of Omar advanced at the same time into Persia. The last of the Persian kings, whom we call Hormisdas the Fourth, gave battle to the Arabians, at some leagues distance from Madain, which was then the capital of that empire, where he lost both the battle and his life. The Persians then passed under the dominion of Omar, more easily than they had submitted to the yoke of Alexander.

Then fell the ancient religion of the Magi, which the conqueror of Darius had treated with respect; for he never interfered in the worship of the nations he subdued.

The Magi, worshippers of one only God, and averse to idols, revered fire, which animates all nature, as an emblem of the Deity. They regarded their religion as the purest and most ancient; and the knowledge they had acquired of the mathematics, astronomy, and history, encreased their contempt for their ignorant conquerors; they could not therefore forsake a religion, consecrated by so many ages, for a new doctrine professed by their enemies. The greatest part of them retired to the extremities of Persia and India, where they live at present under the name of *Gaures* or *Guebres*, marrying only amongst themselves; keeping up the sacred fire, and adhering to what they know of their ancient worship; yet they are ignorant, despised, and, except in their poverty, resemble the Jews, who have so long been dispersed, without being allied to other nations: they have a still greater resemblance to the Banians, who live nowhere but in India and Persia, where they are scattered

tered in different parts. Many families of the Guebres or *Ignicolæ* * remained at Ispahan till the reign of Shah-Abbas, who expelled them from thence, as Isabella did the Jews from Spain. They have since however been tolerated in the suburbs of that city by his successors. The *Ignicolæ* have long cursed Alexander and Mahomet in their prayers, and it is probable that to these they have since joined Shah-Abbas.

While one of Omar's lieutenants subdued Persia, another took all Egypt and a great part of Lybia from the Romans. The famous library of Alexandria, a monument of the knowledge and errors of mankind, which had been begun by Ptolemy Philadelphus, and augmented by a number of succeeding kings, was burnt in this conquest. At that time the Saracens would have no other learning than that of the Koran; but they afterwards discovered a genius capable of the greatest undertakings. The re-establishment of the ancient canal in Egypt, first dug by the kings of that country, and afterwards repaired by Trajan, to open a communication between the Nile and the Red Sea, was an enterprize worthy of the most enlightened ages. A governor of Egypt, under the caliphate of Omar, sat about this great work and completed it. What a difference between the genius of the Arabians and that of the Turks? The latter have suffered a work to go to ruin, the preservation of which was of more importance than the acquisition of a large province.

The lovers of antiquity, they who delight in comparing the geniuses of different nations, will see with pleasure how greatly the manners and customs in the time of Mahomet, Abubeker and Omar resembled those ancient manners which have been so faithfully described to us by Homer. They will see the chiefs of one party defy those of the enemy to single com-

* Worshippers of fire. T.

bat; and advancing from their respective ranks to decide the fate of the day in the presence of both armies, who remain inactive spectators of the contest, while the combatants mutually interrogate each other, return defiance for defiance, and invoke the aid of the gods before they begin the fight. There were several of these single combats fought at the siege of Damascus.

It is evident that the combats of the Amazons, mentioned by Homer and Herodotus, were not founded upon fabulous reports. The women of the tribe of Imiar, in Arabia Felix, were warriors, and fought in the armies of Abubeker and Omar. We are not to believe however that there was a kingdom of Amazons, where the women lived without men. But in the times and in the countries in which every one led a rural and pastoral life, it was not to be wondered at, that the women, who were brought up as hardy as the men, should sometimes have fought as well as them. At the siege of Damascus we have a particular instance of one of those women of the tribe of Imiar, who in revenge for the loss of her husband, who was slain by her side, shot the governor of the city dead with an arrow. Nothing can justify Ariosto and Tasso more than this, for introducing so many female warriors in their poems.

History will afford you many similar examples in the times of chivalry. These customs, which were at all times extremely rare, appear now-a-days incredible, especially since the invention of artillery, which deprives the combatants of those resources which were formerly derived from personal bravery, skill, and agility, and since armies are become a kind of regular machines that move, as it were, by springs.

The speeches of the Arabian heroes at the head of their armies, whether previous to a single combat or to the ratifying a truce, are entirely in that

L

natural

natural taste which we find in Homer, but incomparably more enthusiastic and sublime.

About the eleventh year of the Hegira, in a battle fought between the army of Heraclius and that of the Saracens, the Mahometan General, named Derar, being taken prisoner, the Arabians were struck with a panic at this event, when Rasi, one of their captains, running towards them, cried out, "*What matters it whether Derar is taken or killed? God is living and looks upon you, fight on.*" With this speech he rallied them, and gained the victory.

Another cries out, "Yonder is heaven, fight for God, and he will give you the earth."

The Mahometan general Caled, having taken the daughter of Heraclius at Damascus, sent her back to her father without a ransom. He was asked why he acted thus: "It is," says he, "because I hope soon to take her again with her father at Constantinople."

When the Caliph Mohavia, on his death bed, in the sixtieth year of the Hegira, secured the throne of the Caliphs, which till then had been elective, to his son Yefud, he said, "Great God! if I have settled my son on the throne, because I thought him worthy of it, I beseech thee to lend him thy support; but if I have acted only as a father, I pray thee to drive him from it."

Every thing that happened in those days was characteristic of a nation superior to all others. The success of this conquering people seems to have been owing more to the enthusiasm with which they were animated, than to their leaders: for Omar was assassinated by a Persian slave in 653; and Otman, his successor, was slain in a tumult in 655. Aly, the famous son-in-law of Mahomet, was elected, and governed only in the midst of troubles. He was assassinated like his predecessors at the end of five years, and yet the Mahometan arms were always prosperous. This

Caliph

Caliph Aly, whom the Persians revere to this day, and whose principles they follow in opposition to those of Omar, transferred the seat of empire from the city of Medina, where Mahomet lies buried, to the city of Couffa, on the banks of the Euphrates, the ruins of which are now scarcely to be found: this has been the fate of Babylon, Seleucia, and all the ancient cities of Chaldea, that were only built with brick.

It is evident that the genius of the Arabians, being put in motion by Mahomet, did all of itself during almost three centuries, and in this respect resembled the genius of the ancient Romans. The greatest conquests were indeed made under Yalid, the least warlike of all the Caliphs. One of his generals extended his empire as far as Samarcand, in 707. Another attacked the Greek empire at the same time towards the Black Sea. A third, in 711, passed over from Egypt into Spain, which had been successively subdued with ease by the Carthaginians, the Romans, the Goths and Vandals, and last of all by these Arabians, who were called Moors. There they erected the kingdom of Cordova. Indeed the Sultan of Egypt shook off the yoke of the Grand Caliph of Bagdat; and Abderama, governor of the conquered part of Spain, no longer acknowledged the Sultan of Egypt; still however, the Mahometan arms were every where victorious.

This Abderama, who was grandson to the Caliph Hesham, conquered the kingdoms of Castile, Navarre, Portugal, and Arragon. He established himself in Languedoc, seized on Guienne and Poitou; and had it not been for Charles Martel, who deprived him of victory and life, France would have been a Mahometan province.

After the reign of nineteen Caliphs of the family of the Ommiades, succeeded the dynasty of the Abassides, about the year 752 of our æra. Abou-giafar Almanzor, who was the second Caliph of the

Abassides, fixed the seat of that great empire at Bagdat, beyond the Euphrates, in Chaldea. The Turks say that he laid the foundations of Bagdat, but the Persians affirm that it was even at that time very ancient, and that he only repaired it. This is the city which is sometimes called Babylon, and which has been the occasion of so many wars between the Turks and Persians.

The dominion of the Caliphs lasted six hundred and fifty-five years. They were as despotic in religion as in government, and though not adored like the Great Lama, enjoyed a more substantial authority; and even at the time of their decay were respected by the Princes who persecuted them. All the Turkish, Arabian, and Tartar Sultans derived their authority from the Caliphs, with less reluctance than many Christian Princes have received theirs from the Pope: they did not indeed kiss the feet of the Caliph, but they prostrated themselves at the threshold of his palace.

If ever any power threatened all the earth, it was certainly that of the Caliphs; for they enjoyed at the same time the privileges of the throne and the altar, and were supported in these not only by the arms, but by the enthusiasm of their subjects. Their orders were considered as oracles, and their soldiers were so many fanatics.

In the year 671 they laid siege to Constantinople, which was one day to become Mahometan: the almost inevitable divisions among so many ferocious chiefs did not put a stop to their conquests; for in this particular they resembled the ancient Romans, who amidst their civil wars subdued Asia Minor.

In proportion as the Mahometans grew powerful, they became polite. These Caliphs, who were always acknowledged as the sovereigns of religion, and apparently of the empire, by those who no longer received their orders at such a distance, lived in tranquillity in their new Babylon, and soon revived the arts. Aaron al Rachild, cotemporary with Charlemagne,

magne, was more respectable than any of his predecessors, and knew how to make himself obeyed even in Spain and India: he revived the sciences, taught the agreeable and useful arts to flourish, drew learned men into his country, composed verses, and throughout the whole of his vast dominions substituted politeness to barbarism. During his reign the Arabians, who had already adopted the Indian method of computation by nine figures and a cypher, brought them to us. We were solely indebted in France and Germany to these Arabians for a knowledge of the course of the stars: the very word *almanack* is still a proof of this.

The *Almagest* of Ptolemy was then translated from the Greek into Arabic, by Benhonain the astronomer. The Caliph Almamon caused a degree of the meridian to be measured by the rules of geometry, in order to determine the magnitude of the earth: an operation that was not performed in France till above nine hundred years after, in the reign of Lewis XIV. This astronomer Benhonain carried his observations very far, and discovered, that either Ptolemy had fixed the sun's greatest declination too far north, or that the obliquity of the ecliptic was changed: he even found that the period of thirty-six thousand years assigned for the pretended motion of the fixed stars from the west to the east, ought to be greatly shortened.

Both chemistry and physic were cultivated by the Arabians. The first of these, chemistry, has indeed been brought to perfection by us, but for the discovery of it we are entirely indebted to them. We owe to them the new remedies called *minoratives*, which are milder and more salutary than those that were before in use in the school of Hippocrates and Galen.

(Algebra was likewise one of their inventions. The word itself is indeed a sufficient proof of this, whether we derive it from the term *Algiabarat*, or suppose it

to be named after *Geber*, the famous Arabian, who taught it in our eighth century. In short, in the second century after Mahomet, the Christians of the West were obliged to derive all their knowledge from the Mussulmen.

An infallible proof of the superior genius of a nation in regard to the polite arts, is the cultivation of true poetry. I speak not of those bombast and high-flown compositions, or of that heap of insipid and common-place expressions about the sun, the moon, and the stars, or the mountains and seas; but of that bold yet elegant taste which obtained in the reign of Augustus, and which we have seen revived under Lewis XIV. This poetry, which abounds with imagery and sentiment, was known in the time of Aaron al Rachild. Amidst a variety of examples, I shall select one that strikes me, and give it because it is concise. It relates to the celebrated disgrace of Giafar Barmecides.*

Weak mortal,
Whom Fortune has indulg'd
With all her dang'rous gifts,
Learn, from the fate of Barmecides,
How transitory is kingly favour,
And dread being happy.

The last line is translated word for word. Nothing can be more beautiful in my opinion than, *dread being happy*. The Arabic tongue had the advantage of being brought to perfection a long time ago. It was ascertained even before the time of Mahomet, and has not been materially changed since. There is not at present the least vestige of any of the jargons that were spoken at that time in Europe. Which

* The preceptor, and afterwards the Vizir and favourite of Aaron al Rachild. He had several sons, all of whom, as well as their father, rose to great power. The cause of their disgrace is variously related by the Arabian writers. T.

way soever we turn ourselves, we must own we were born but yesterday. We go beyond other nations in more than one respect, and the reason of this is perhaps because we came the last.

C H A P. VII.

Of the Koran and Mahometan Law.—With an Inquiry whether this was a new Religion, and whether it has been of a persecuting Spirit.

WE have already seen in the preceding chapter what were the menaces of Mahomet and the Arabians, by whom a considerable part of the world experienced so great and rapid a revolution. It now remains to give a faithful picture of their religion.

We have long held a mistaken notion that the Mahometan religion made so rapid a progress only because it favoured voluptuous inclinations; but we do not reflect that all the ancient religions of the East admitted a plurality of wives. Mahomet reduced the number to four, which till his time had been unlimited. It is said that David had eighteen wives, and Solomon three hundred, together with seven hundred concubines. This king used to drink wine with these companions. It was therefore the Jewish religion that was voluptuous, and that of Mahomet was severe.

It is a great problem among politicians, whether polygamy is useful to society and population. The eastern nations have decided this question in all ages, and nature seems to agree with those people in almost every species of the animal creation, where we observe that several females have only one male. The time lost in breeding, in bringing forth, and in the other disorders incident to the female sex, seems

seems to call for some opportunities of reparation. The women in hot countries soon cease to be handsome and capable of bearing children. The head of a family, who places his glory and prosperity in the number of his children, has an absolute necessity for another woman to supply the place of an useless wife. Our laws in the West seem to be more favourable to the women; those of the East to the men and to the state. There is no object of legislature which may not be made the subject of dispute. But this is not the place for a dissertation, our aim is to describe men rather than to judge them.

People are every day exclaiming against the sensual paradise of Mahomet; but the ancients never knew any other. Hercules had espoused Hebe in heaven as a reward for the labours he had experienced on earth. Heroes were regaled with nectar at the tables of the gods; and as man was supposed to rise again after death with all his senses about him, it was very natural to suppose likewise that he would taste, either in a garden or on some other globe, the pleasures peculiar to the senses, and which ought to be enjoyed while these continue to subsist. This belief was even that of the fathers of the church in the second and third century. It is asserted in express terms by St. Justin, in the second part of his dialogues, that "Jerusalem shall be enlarged and embellished to receive the saints, who will there enjoy during a thousand years, all the pleasures of the senses."

An hundred writers copying after one another, have asserted that the Koran was composed by a Nestorian monk. Some have given this monk the name of Sergius; others call him Boheira. But it is evident that the chapters of the Alcoran were written occasionally by Mahomet, either in his journies or on his military expeditions. Was this monk always with him? It has likewise been imagined from an equivocal passage in the Koran, that Mahomet could neither write nor read. But is it probable that a man who has been

in

in trade twenty years, and who was a poet, a physician and a legislator, should have been ignorant of what was known to all the children of his tribe?

The Koran, or as it is improperly called the Alcoran, implies simply *the book*. It is not an historical work, in which the author has aimed at an imitation of the writings of the Hebrews, and our Evangelists; neither is it a book purely containing a body of laws, like those of Leviticus and Deuteronomy; nor is it a collection of psalms and spiritual songs, nor a prophetic vision and allegory like the Apocalypse: it is a mixture of all these several kinds of writing; a body of homilies, in which we meet with some historical facts, some visions, some revelation, and some laws, both civil and religious.

The Koran is become the code of jurisprudence, as well as of the canonical law, with all the Mahometan nations.

All the interpreters of this book allow that its morality is contained in these words, "Court him who discards thee; give to him who taketh from thee; forgive those who have offended thee; do good to all; never dispute with the ignorant." Mahomet ought much rather to have recommended it to his followers not to dispute with the learned; but in that part of the world, it was never imagined that there was learning or science elsewhere.

Among the incoherent declamations with which this book is filled, according to the eastern taste, we meet with some passages that are truly sublime. Mahomet, for example, in speaking of the cessation of the deluge, expresses himself thus: "God said, earth absorb thy waters, heaven drink up the showers thou hast poured down; the heaven and the earth obeyed."

The definition of God is expressed in a manner still more sublime. On being asked who was that Allah whom he preached, he replied, "It is he who
M " holds

“ holds his being of myself, and from whom all
 “ other beings are derived; who begetteth not,
 “ neither is begotten; and who has no likeness
 “ throughout the whole extent of beings.” This
 famous answer, which is held sacred throughout the
 East, is to be met with in the last chapter but one of
 the Koran.

It is true that contradictions, absurdities, and anachronisms are plentifully scattered through the whole of this book. We observe in it, above all, a profound ignorance of those parts of natural philosophy which are the most simple and the most known. This is the touchstone of the books which false religions pretend to have been written by the Divinity; for God is neither absurd nor ignorant; but the vulgar, who are incapable of distinguishing these errors, adore them, while their Imans or priests employ a deluge of words to palliate them.

The commentators on the Koran always make a distinction between the positive and allegorical sense, that is, between the letter and the spirit. The Arabian genius is as distinguishable in the commentary as in the text. One of the most approved commentators, says that the “ Koran sometimes wears the “ face of a man, and sometimes that of a beast,” to signify the spirit and the letter.

One thing that will perhaps surprise the generality of readers is, that there is nothing new in the law of Mahomet, excepting that Mahomet is the prophet of God.

In the first place, the unity of a Supreme Being, the creator and preserver of the universe, is a doctrine of very ancient date. The rewards and punishments of a future state, the belief of an heaven and an hell, had been long admitted by the Chinese, the Indians, the Persians, the Greeks, the Romans, afterwards by the Jews, and particularly by the Christians, whose religion seemed to sanctify this doctrine.

The

The Koran acknowledges the existence of angels and the genii, and this belief is derived from the ancient Persians. That of a resurrection and last judgment, was obviously taken from the Talmud, and the doctrines of Christianity. The thousand years which, according to Mahomet, God will employ in judging mankind, and the manner in which he will do it, are adventitious circumstances, which in no wise hinder this notion from being entirely borrowed. The narrow bridge, over which those who arise at the last day are to pass, and from which the damned are to fall into hell, is taken from the allegorical doctrine of the Magi.

It was from these very Magi, and their *Jannat*, that Mahomet first took his ideas of a paradise or garden, where men, after rising again to life, with all their faculties in perfection, are to taste by these very senses all those pleasures which are peculiar to their nature, and which without those senses would be useless. He was likewise indebted to them for his idea of the *Houris*, those heavenly women, who are to be the portion of the elect, and whom the Magi named *Hourani*, as may be seen in the *Sadder*. He does not exclude women from his paradise, as we have so often heard reported. This is only a raillery without foundation, such as all nations are found to ascribe to each other. Mahomet promises delicious gardens, which he calls paradise, to his followers; but the height of their bliss is to consist in their intercourse with the Supreme Being.

The doctrine of absolute predestination and fatality, which seems in our days to be the peculiar characteristic of the Mahometan faith, was the opinion of all the ancients, and is as easily to be distinguished in the *Iliad* as in the Koran.

With regard to legal ordinances, such as circumcision, ablutions, prayers, and the pilgrimage to Mecca, Mahomet in these only conformed himself to established customs. Circumcision had been prac-

tified time immemorial among the Arabians, the ancient Egyptians, the people of Colchis, and the Jews. Ablution had been always recommended in the East, as a symbol of the purity of the soul.

There is no religion without prayers; the law by which Mahomet obliged his followers to pray five times a day was inconvenient, but even this inconvenience was respectable. Who would dare to complain that a creature should be obliged five times a day to worship his Creator?

As to the pilgrimage to Mecca, and the ceremonies to be practised in the Kaaba, and on the black stone, there are few who do not know that this had been a favourite devotion among the Arabians for many ages. The Kaaba was held to be the most ancient temple in the world; and although no less than three hundred idols were worshipped therein at that time, the holiness of the place was derived principally from the black stone, which was said to have been the tomb-stone of Ishmael. Instead of abolishing this pilgrimage, Mahomet, in order to conciliate the good opinion of the Arabians, made it a fundamental precept.

Fasting had been observed by almost every nation, particularly by the Jews and Christians. Mahomet made it extremely strict, by extending it to a whole lunar month, during which time it was not permitted even to taste a drop of water, or to smooke, till after-sun set, and this lunar month frequently falling out in the midst of summer, the fasting was rendered so very severe, that at length they were obliged to mitigate it, especially in time of war.

All religions recommend the giving of alms; the Mahometan is the only one that enjoins it as a lawful, positive and indispensable precept. The Koran commands every one to set apart two and an half per cent. of their income for this purpose, either in money or goods.

In

In all these positive ordinances we find nothing but what was founded on the most ancient customs. Among the negative precepts, namely, those which enjoin any particular abstinence, you will find only that which prohibits the drinking of wine, to be new and peculiar to the Mahometan religion. This prohibition, of which the Mussulmen so much complain, and with the observance of which they frequently dispense, especially in cold countries, was given in a fiery climate, where the use of wine easily deprives men of their health and reason. It was no new thing, however, for persons devoted to the service of the Divinity, to abstain from this liquor. Several colleges of priests in Egypt, Syria and India, and the Nazarenes and Rechabites among the Jews, voluntarily imposed on themselves a similar mortification.

This injunction was by no means disgusting to the Arabians: Mahomet did not foresee that it would one day become insupportable to his followers in Thrace, Macedonia, Bosnia and Servia. He was not aware that his countrymen would one day penetrate into the heart of France, or that Turks of his religion would be seen before the walls of Vienna.

The same may be said of the prohibition of eating pork, blood, or the flesh of beasts dying of any disease; these are precepts of health. The flesh of swine in particular is a very unwholesome food in those hot countries, as well as in Palestine, that lies near them. When the Mahometan religion spread itself into colder climates, this prohibition was no longer reasonable, but nevertheless did not cease to be in force.

The prohibiting all games of chance, is perhaps the only law of which no example is to be found in any other religion. It resembles the rule of a convent, rather than a general law to be observed by a whole nation. It would seem as if Mahomet had formed a people only to pray, to weep and to fight.

His

His laws, which if we except those relating to polygamy, were all of them so austere, and his doctrine which was so plain and simple, soon gained his religion both respect and credit. Above all, his teaching the unity of one God, in a manner free from mystery, and suited to the human understanding, drew over a multitude of nations (even of negroes on the coast of Africa, and of those who inhabited the islands in the Indian sea) to embrace his faith.

This religion is called *Islamim*, a word which implies resignation to the will of God, and which was of itself sufficient to make a number of profelytes. It was not by dint of arms that the Islamim established itself throughout more than the half of our hemisphere, but by enthusiasm, by persuasion, and, above all, by the example of the conquerors themselves, which has always so much effect on the conquered. Mahomet when he first took arms in Arabia against his countrymen, who opposed his imposture, put to death, without mercy, all those who would not embrace his religion. He was not at that time sufficiently powerful to let those live who might afterwards subvert his infant faith. But as soon as he had firmly established it in Arabia, by dint of preaching and the sword, his followers, when they made excursions beyond their own country, which till then they had never quitted, did not compel the strangers they conquered to embrace the Mahometan religion, but left it to their option either to profess this new faith or to pay a tribute. They were desirous of plunder, conquest, and making slaves; but not of obliging these slaves to change their belief. When they were at length driven out of Asia by the Turks and Tartars, they made profelytes even of their conquerors: and the Tartar hords became a great Mussulman people. By this we may see that they did in fact convert more people than they conquered.

The

The little I have here said is indeed contradictory to what we have been told by our historians, our declaimers and our own mistaken notions; but the truth ought to prevail against all these.

Let us confine ourselves to this historical truth; the mussulman lawgiver, who was a powerful and terrible conqueror, established his tenets by his courage, and by his arms; yet his religion became in time indulgent and tolerating. The divine institutor of Christianity, living in humility and peace, preached the forgiveness of injuries, and yet we see his mild and holy religion, by the mistaken zeal of his followers, is become the least tolerating of any.

The Mahometans, like us, have had their sects and scholastic disputes; but it is by no means true that they have seventy-three different sects among them. This is one of their reveries. They have pretended that the Magi had seventy; the Jews seventy-one; the Christians seventy-two; and that the Mussulmen, as being the most perfect, must necessarily have seventy-three. A strange kind of perfection, and well worthy the schoolmen of every country.

The different explanations of the Koran have given rise to two sects, called the Orthodox and the Heretic. The Orthodox are the Sonnites, that is to say, the traditionists, or those doctors who are attached to the most ancient tradition, which serves as a supplement to the Koran. These are again divided into four sects, one of which prevails at this time in Constantinople; another in Africa, a third in Arabia, and a fourth in Tartary and Arabia, and are all looked upon as equally useful for salvation.

The Heretics are those who deny an absolute predestination, or who differ from the Sonnites in some scholastic points. Mahometanism has had its Pelagians, its Scotists, its Thomists, its Molinists, and its Jansenists. Neither of these sects has produced greater revolutions than amongst us. A sect, to oc-

caſion any great commotions in a ſtate, muſt attack the fundamental principles of the prevailing ſect, accuſe it of impiety, and of being an enemy to God and men ; and muſt ſet up a ſtandard that may eaſily be perceived and underſtood by the moſt ignorant of the people, and under which they may eaſily range themſelves. Such was the ſect of Aly, which ſet itſelf up for a rival to that of Omar ; but it was not till the ſixth century that this great ſchiſm was introduced, and political motives had a much greater ſhare in eſtabliſhing it than thoſe of religion.

C H A P. VIII.

Of Italy and the Church before Charlemagne.—Of the Manner in which Chriſtianity was eſtabliſhed.—An Inquiry whether it experienced ſo much Perſecution as has been aſſerted.

THERE is no ſubject more worthy of our curioſity, than the manner in which God was pleaſed to eſtabliſh his church, by making the ſecond cauſes concur with his eternal decrees. Let us reſpectfully leave whatever is divine to thoſe who are the depoſitaries of religion, and confine ourſelves to hiſtory. Some of St. John's diſciples began by taking up their reſidence in that part of Arabia neareſt to Jeruſalem ; but Chriſt's diſciples ſpread themſelves all over the world. The Platonic philoſophers of Alexandria, where there were ſo many Jews, united with the primitive Chriſtians, who borrowed certain expreſſions from their philoſophy, ſuch as the word *logos*, but without borrowing all their ideas. There were already ſeveral Chriſtians at Rome in Nero's time ; but they were confounded with the Jews, becauſe they came from the ſame country, ſpoke the ſame language, and abſtained from the aliments prohibited by

by the Mosaic law ; besides many of them were circumcised and observed the sabbath. They were still so obscure however, that neither the historian Josephus, nor Philon, make the least mention of them in their writings ; yet it is evident that these half Jews, half Christians, were from the beginning divided into a variety of sects, such as Ebionites, Marcionites, Carpocratians, Valentinians, and Cainites. Those of Alexandria were very different from those of Syria, and these again differed from the Achaïans. Each party had its evangelist, and the real Jews were the implacable enemies of all these sects.

These Jews, who were no less austere than knavish, were still to the number of four thousand at Rome. In the time of Augustus there were eight thousand ; but Tiberius sent one half of them to Sardinia, in order to people the island, and to ease the city of Rome of a multitude of usurers. Far from being interrupted in their religious worship, they enjoyed the toleration which the Romans liberally extended to all religions. They were allowed to have synagogues and magistrates of their own nation, as they have still in modern Rome, where they are more numerous. The Romans held them in the same light as we do the negroes ; they considered them as an inferior species of men. They who in these Jewish colonies had not a sufficiency of talents to apply themselves to some useful trade, and who were unable to cut leather and make sandals, composed fables. They knew the names of the angels, of Adam's second wife and of her preceptor, and they made love potions, which they sold to the Roman ladies. Their hatred to the Christians, whether Galileans, or Nazareens, partook of that fury with which almost every religious sect has been animated against those who have separated themselves from their communion. They accused the Jewish Christians of the fire which consumed a part of Rome under Nero. It was as unjust to impute this accident to the Christians as to the Emperor. Neither he,

N

nor

nor the Christians, nor the Jews, could have any interest in setting Rome on fire. But there was a necessity for appeasing a populace incensed against these strangers, who were equally detested by the Romans and the Jews. A few poor wretches were sacrificed to the public vengeance. This instance of violence ought not, I apprehend, to be reckoned among the persecutions which the Christians underwent on account of their faith; it had nothing at all to do with their religion, which was not so much as known, and which the Romans confounded with Judaism, then under the protection of the laws, however despised it might be.

If it is true that in Spain they have found inscriptions, in which Nero is thanked *for having abolished a new superstition in that province*, the antiquity of those monuments is extremely doubtful. If they are authentic, no mention is made of Christianity in them; and after all, if those injurious monuments were really intended for the Christians, to whom can we impute them but to the Jews, who were settled in Spain, and who detested Christianity as an enemy born among themselves.

It is by no means our intention to search into the impenetrable obscurity, which involves the church in its infant state, and which the disquisitions of the learned have in general served only to increase.

It is very certain, however, that nothing but the ignorance and fanaticism of those writers who servilely copied a first impostor, could possibly have ranked among the Popes, the Apostle Peter, Lin, Clet, and others in the first century.

During the space of near one hundred years there was no sacred government among the Christians. Their assemblies were held in secret like those of the Quakers in these days. They adhered literally to the precept of their Divine Master, *The Princes of the earth shall rule, but it shall not be thus with you; whoever wishes to be first shall be last.* A church government could

could not take place till the society became numerous, and it was not till the time of Trajan that we find any mention made of *Episcopoi*, *Inspectors*, a term we have exchanged for that of Bishop. In none of the authors who wrote during the first ages of the church do we meet with the term *Pope*. This title was unknown amongst the small number of Jews who assumed at Rome the name of Christians.

It is acknowledged by all men of real learning that Simon Barjone, surnamed Peter, never went to Rome. We smile now-a-days at the proofs of this journey, that have been drawn by some absurd writers from an epistle attributed to this apostle, who was born in Galilee. In this letter he says he is at Babylon. The only authors who mention his pretended martyrdom have long been considered as the compilers of idle stories, such as Hegesippus, Marcellus, and Abdias, who have since been copied by Eusebius. They relate that Simon Peter, and another Simon, whom they stile the *magician*, disputed together at Rome in the time of Nero, which of the two could restore a dead man to life, and which could rise to the greatest height in the air. In this competition they assure us that Simon Peter threw down the other Simon, who was in favour with Nero, and that the Emperor being irritated by this, condemned Peter to be crucified; when the apostle, as a mark of his humility, requested to be executed with his head downwards. These ridiculous tales are now laughed at and despised by all well-informed Christians; but from the days of Constantine till the revival of learning and good sense, nobody ventured to doubt their authenticity.

As a proof that St. Peter did not die at Rome, it will be sufficient to observe, that the first church the Christians erected in that city was that of St. John de Lateran. This, which was the first Latin church, would surely not have been dedicated to St. John if St. Peter had been Pope.

The pretended list of the first Popes is taken from a book entitled, the *Pontificate of Damascus*, which in speaking of *Lin*, the pretended successor of St. Peter, asserts that *Lin* continued to be Pope till the 13th year of the Emperor Nero, the very year, by the bye, in which St. Peter is said to have been crucified, so that if this were true, there must have been two Popes at the same time. In short, what ought to remove every difficulty on this subject in the eye of discerning Christians is, that neither in the Acts of the Apostles, nor in the Epistles of St. Paul, is there a word said of Simon Peter's journey to Rome. The terms pontifical and papal chair, when applied to St. Peter, are therefore evidently ridiculous. What chair, or what pontificate could there be in an obscure assembly of some of the dregs of the Jewish populace! and yet on this fable is the papal authority founded, and supported even now after all its losses. Let the reader judge after this how much the world is governed by prejudice, and how triumphant falsehood is over ignorance. It was in this manner formerly that the illiterate annalists of Europe reckoned amongst the Kings of France a Pharamond, and his father Marcomir, and gave the names of the Kings of Spain, Sweden, and Scotland from the time of the deluge. It must be confessed that history, as well as natural philosophy, did not begin to emerge from obscurity till the latter end of the 16th century. Reason is still in its infancy.

It is likewise very certain that it was never the disposition of the senate to persecute any man on account of his opinion, and that no Emperor ever attempted to force the Jews to change their religion, either after the revolt in Vespasian's reign, or in that which broke out under Adrian. Their worship, it is true, was derided and insulted, and statues were erected in their temple before its demolition; but never did any of the Cæsars, or the Pro-consuls, or the Roman Senate
with

wish to hinder the Jews from believing their law. This reason is sufficient to shew the liberty Christianity had to extend itself in private, after having obscurely established itself in the very bosom of Judaism.

None of the Emperors molested the Christians till the reign of Domitian. Dion Cassius, says that under this Emperor there were some people condemned as Atheists, and for imitating the manners of the Jews. It seems that this persecution, of which we have but very imperfect accounts, was neither long nor general. We cannot exactly tell why some Christians were exiled, nor why they were recalled. How is it possible to believe Tertullian who, upon the credit of Hegesippus, seriously informs us, that Domitian examined the grandsons of the Apostle St. Jude of the race of David, of whose pretensions to the throne of Judea he was jealous, and finding them to be poor and miserable, he discontinued the persecution. Even if it had been possible for a Roman emperor to have been afraid of the pretended descendants of David, when Jerusalem was destroyed, his malice would have been directed not against the Christians but the Jews. But who can imagine that the master of all the known world should have been uneasy about the pretensions of St. Jude's two sons to the kingdom of Palestine, or that he was ever at the trouble of examining them? Thus it is that histories have been unfortunately written by so many persons who had more piety than discernment.

Nerva, Vespasian, Titus, Trajan, Adrian, and the Antoninus's were by no means persecutors. Trajan, who renewed the prohibition of all private assemblies (a prohibition which had before been decreed by the law of the twelve tables) wrote notwithstanding to Pliny, "No enquiry must be made after the Christians;" a sufficient proof this that they might conceal themselves, and exercise their religion with prudence,

dence, though through the malice of the priests and the hatred of the Jews, they were frequently carried before the magistrates, and punished. The people hated them, and especially the people of the provinces, who are always more uncivilized, more superstitious and more averse to toleration than those of the capital. They excited the magistrates against them, and cried out for their being exposed to wild beasts in the Circus. Adrian not only gave it in charge to Fondanus the Proconsul of Asia Minor not to persecute them, but his orders expressly direct, "If any one asserts false things of the Christians, let the slanderer be severely punished."

It is this regard to justice in Adrian, that has given rise to the erroneous supposition of his having been himself a Christian. But would he who erected a temple to Antinous, have erected one to Jesus Christ?

Marcus Aurelius ordained that the Christians should not be persecuted on the account of religion. Caracalla, Heliogabalus, Alexander, Philip, Gallien, openly protected them: therefore they had full leisure to extend and to strengthen their infant church. They held five councils in the first century, sixteen in the second, and thirty-six in the third. They had magnificent altars so early as this third century: the Ecclesiastical History mentions some that were adorned with silver columns, which together weighed three thousand marks. The chalices, made after the model of the Roman cups, as also the covers, were of pure gold.

The Christians enjoyed so great a degree of liberty, notwithstanding the outcries and persecutions of their enemies, that they publicly erected churches in several provinces on the ruins of temples that were fallen to decay. Both Origen and St. Cyprian acknowledge this; and the church must certainly have enjoyed a long repose, since those two great men reproach

proach their cotemporaries already with luxury, effeminacy, and avarice, as the result of happiness and plenty. St. Cyprian in the most express terms complains that several Bishops, instead of imitating the holy examples that were placed before them, "Accumulated large sums of money, enriched themselves by usury, and defrauded people of their lands." These are his own words; they are an evident proof of the happiness and ease the Christians enjoyed under the Roman laws. The abuse of a thing is a demonstration of its existence.

If Decius, Maximinus, and Dioclesian persecuted the Christians, it was for reasons of state: Decius, because they sided with Philip, who was suspected himself, though unjustly, of being a Christian: Maximinus, because they supported Gordian. They enjoyed the greatest liberty during the space of twenty years under Dioclesian; and this liberty not only extended to the free exercise of their religion, which the Roman state had at all times granted to all its subjects, but they were likewise admitted to participate of all the privileges of the Romans themselves. Several Christians were appointed governors of provinces. Eusebius speaks of two Christians, Dorotheus and Gorgonius, who were officers of the palace, and on whom Dioclesian lavished his favours. All that our declaimers have written against this Emperor, is therefore to be considered only as a calumny founded on ignorance. So far was he from persecuting the Christians, that he raised them to a degree of power of which it was not in his power to deprive them.

In 303, Cæsar Galerius, who hated them, prevailed on Dioclesian to demolish the cathedral church of Nicomedia, which had been erected opposite to the Emperor's palace. A Christian publicly tore the edict, and was punished. A few days after, part of Galerius's palace was consumed by fire; and the
Christians

Christians were supposed to be the incendiaries. As yet, however, they were not subject to any capital punishment. The tenour of the edict was that their temples and books should be burnt, and their persons divested of all honours. So far Dioclesian never intended to lay any constraint upon them in regard to religion. After his victory over the Persians he published some edicts against the Manicheans, who were devoted to the Persian interest, and secret enemies of the Roman empire. These edicts were owing intirely to political motives. Had they been dictated by religious zeal, a zeal with which conquerors are so rarely actuated, the Christians would have been included. But they were not; so that they must have enjoyed a repose of twenty years under Dioclesian, during which time their religion gained ground; nor were they molested in his whole reign more than two years; and even then Lactantius, Eusebius, and the Emperor Constantine himself impute this severity to Galerius only and not to Dioclesian. And indeed it is not at all probable that a man who had philosophy enough to abdicate the imperial dignity, should have so little as to be a fanatical persecutor.

Dioclesian was indeed only a soldier of fortune, but this very circumstance is a proof of his great merit. We can judge of a prince only by his exploits and his laws. The warlike actions of Dioclesian were great and his laws just. We are indebted to him for the law which renders all contracts for sale of no effect, in which a fraudulent advantage is taken by either party. He himself acknowledges this law to have been dictated by humanity, and his expression is "*humanum est.*"

He was the protector of orphans, whose interests are in general too much neglected. He directed that the capital of their estates should carry interest.

It was with no less wisdom than equity, that in thus protecting the property of minors, he took care at the same time to guard against any abuses these same minors might commit, in defrauding their creditors, by ordaining that whoever should be guilty of such a fraud, should be excluded from the benefit of the above mentioned law. Such was the man whom ignorance and superstition have represented as an implacable enemy of the faithful; and his reign as a continued scene of massacre and persecution. All which is wholly contrary to truth. The æra of martyrdom which is usually dated from the accession of Dioclesian, ought therefore to take place only two years before his abdication, it being evident that he occasioned no martyrdom, during the first twenty years of his reign.

It is truly a contemptible story, that his resigning the imperial dignity, was from the regret he felt at not being able to abolish Christianity. Had he been so virulent a persecutor he would, on the contrary, have continued to reign, in order to destroy that religion; and if he was forced to abdicate, as some affirm without proof, his abdication could not be the effect of vexation and spite. The vanity of dealing in the marvellous, and of swelling the number of martyrs, has been the cause of adding false and improbable persecutions to those which are but too real. It has been asserted that in Dioclesian's reign, in 287, Maximianus Hercules Cæsar condemned to martyrdom, in the middle of the Alps, an entire legion, called the Theban Legion, which consisted of six thousand six hundred men, all Christians, who suffered themselves to be massacred without repining. This famous story was not committed to writing till two hundred years after, by the Abbé Eucher, who relates it upon hearsay. And even granting that there was a Theban legion, which is very doubtful, how could Maximianus Hercules send for this legion,

as he is said to have done, out of the East, only to quell a sedition in Gaul, which had been appeased more than a year before? Why should he destroy six thousand six hundred good troops, when he wanted their assistance to repress this tumult? How could they all be Christians without exception? Why should he murder them upon the road? Who could be their executioners in a narrow pass, between two mountains, near St. Maurice in Valais, where it would be impossible to range four hundred men in order of battle, and where a legion would easily withstand the greatest army? What purpose could such a massacre answer, at a time when the church enjoyed the profoundest tranquillity; and when the Christians had built a magnificent temple at Nicomedia, just opposite to Dioclesian's palace? *The profound peace and full liberty which we enjoyed*, says Eusebius, *had put us off our guard*. Is this profound peace, and this full liberty, reconcileable with the massacre of six thousand six hundred soldiers? If this incredible fact could possibly be true, would Eusebius have omitted to mention it? Such a multitude of real martyrs have sealed the Evangelist with their blood, that we ought to give no share of their glory to those who did not partake of their sufferings. It is certain that Dioclesian, during the two last years of his reign, and Galerius for some years after, did violently persecute the Christians of Asia Minor and the neighbouring countries: but in Spain, Gaul, and England, which were at that time under the dominion of Constantius Chlorus, far from being persecuted, they saw their religion predominant, and Eusebius says, that Maxentius, who was chosen Emperor at Rome in 306, persecuted no one.

They were very useful to Constantius Chlorus, who took them under his protection, and whose concubine Helena publicly embraced Christianity. They must therefore at that time have formed a considerable

siderable party in the state. Their money and their arms contributed to place Constantine on the throne. This is what rendered him odious to the senate, to the people of Rome and to the Pretorians, who had all espoused the cause of Maxentius his competitor for the empire. Our historians speak of Maxentius as a tyrant, because he was unfortunate; and yet it is very certain that he was the lawful Emperor, having been proclaimed by the senate and by the people of Rome,

C H A P. IX.

Proving that the false Legends of the Primitive Christians, were no hindrance to the establishment of Christianity.

JESUS CHRIST permitted the false evangelists to be confounded with the true ones in the very beginning of Christianity; and the better to exercise the faith of his disciples the evangelists we now consider as apocryphal, preceded the four sacred books which at present are the foundation of our belief. This is so true, that the Fathers of the Church in the primitive ages, will be found almost always referring to some of these Evangelists, which no longer subsist. Neither St. Barnabas, nor St. Clement, nor St. Ignatius, nor St. Justin quote any other than these apocryphal books. St. Clement, for example, in the 8th chapter of his second epistle, has the following expressions: "The Lord says, in his Evangelist, if you are not careful of a little, who will entrust you with much?" These words are not to be met with either in St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, or St. John.

It is very evident that among the ten or twelve sects into which the Christians were divided in the

first century, one party never availed themselves of the Evangelists of an opposite sect, unless it was to refute their opinion; but each contented themselves with adducing proofs from the Evangelists of their own party. How can we possibly imagine therefore, that the Fathers of our Holy Church could quote evangelical writings that were not canonical. We ought rather to suppose that those writings were then held to be authentic and sacred.

What would appear to be still more singular, were we strangers to the excesses of which human nature is capable, is, that in each of these Christian sects there were men zealous enough to suffer persecution for the sake of their apochryphal Evangelists. This proves but too clearly, that a false zeal is a martyr to error, in the same manner as a true zeal is a martyr to truth.

We ought not to conceal the pious frauds which the primitive Christians of every sect, unhappily employed towards the advancement of a religion, which stood in no need of so shameful a support. They forged a letter from Pilate to Tiberius, in which the supposed writer is made to say: "The God of the Jews having promised them to send his saint from heaven, to be their King, and that he should be born of a Virgin, did in reality send him during the time of my being in Judea."

They likewise invented a pretended edict of Tiberius, in which Jesus was named among the gods. They invented letters from Seneca to St. Paul, and from St. Paul to Seneca. They likewise forged the testament of the twelve Patriarchs, which was for a long time considered as authentic, and which was even translated into Greek by St. John Chrysostome. They invented other testaments for Moses, Enoch, and Joseph; they even forged the famous book of Enoch which is considered as the very basis of Christianity, since it is in that work only that we meet with an account of the revolt of the angels, and of their

their being precipitated into hell, and changed into devils to tempt mankind. This spurious book was invented so early as the time of the Apostles, and even before the Epistles of St. Jude were written, in which we see the prophecies of this Enoch quoted, who is there stiled the seventh man after Adam.

They fabricated a letter from Jesus Christ to a pretended King of Edessa, at a time when Edessa was without a King and belonged to the Romans.

They likewise fabricated the travels of St. Peter, the Apocalypse of St. Peter, the Acts of St. Peter, the Acts of St. Paul, and the Acts of Pilate; they went so far as to falsify the History of Flavius Josephus, and were imprudent enough to make that Jew, (who was so zealous for the ancient religion of his country), assert that Jesus was the Christ, the Messiah.

They composed the romance of St. Peter's dispute with Simon the magician about a dead man, who was related to the Emperor Nero, and whom they undertook to restore to life. In this idle book there is an account of the contest between the two disputants in the air, and of Simon's dog who carried letters to St. Peter and brought back his answers to them.

They fabricated a great number of Sibylline verses, which were so devoutly received that mention is still made of them in our hymns,

Teste David cum Sibylla,

They also supposed a prodigious number of martyrs, who were confounded as we have already observed with the true ones.

There are still extant the Acts of the Martyrdom of St. Andrew the Apostle, which are looked upon as spurious by the most pious and most learned of our critics, as is the case likewise with the pretended Acts of St. Clement,

Eusebius

Eusebius of Cæsarea, in the fourth century, collected many of these legends. It is in this collection that we meet with the martyrdom of St. James, the elder brother of Jesus Christ, who is said to have been so good a Jew, that at Jerusalem they gave him the name of James the Just. He used to spend whole days in prayer in the temple. He was therefore not of his brother's religion. His countrymen the Jews, pressed him to declare his brother an impostor, but James replied to them, "Know that he is seated at the right hand of the sovereign power of God, and that he is one day to appear in the clouds to judge from thence all the universe."

After him follows a Simeon, who was cousin-german to Jesus Christ, and son of one named Cleophas, and of Mary, who was sister to Mary the mother of Christ. They are pleased to speak of him as being Bishop of Jerusalem. We are told that he was descended in a right line from David; that he was clearly entitled to the throne of Jerusalem as well as St. Jude; that Trajan, who was extremely jealous of the race of David, was by no means so generous and merciful towards this Simeon, as Domitian had been towards the grandsons of St. Jude, but condemned him to be crucified lest he should deprive him of Palestine. This cousin-german of Jesus Christ must have been very old, since we are told he lived under Trajan in the 107th year of our vulgar æra.

They have supposed a long conversation between Trajan and St. Ignatius at Antioch, in which Trajan says to the Saint, "Who art thou impure spirit, infernal dæmon?" and St. Ignatius replies, "I am no impure spirit, but the servant of God." This conversation is exceedingly probable.

We have next an account of a St. Symphorosis, who with her seven children went in a very familiar manner

manner to visit the Emperor Adrian, at the time he was building his beautiful country-seat at Tibur. Adrian, although he never persecuted any one, caused the youngest of the seven brothers to be cut in two from head to foot, and the six others, with the mother, to be put to death in different ways, that he might have the greater diversion.

We are likewise told of a St. Felicity and her seven children, for there must always necessarily be seven, who were all examined and condemned by the Prætor at Rome in the Campus Martius, where, by the bye, it was never customary to examine or condemn any one. The Prætor tried criminals in the Prætorium, but these writers were not aware of this.

St. Polycarpus being condemned to the flames, a voice was heard from heaven, crying, "Courage, Polycarpus, be firm;" and instantly the flames formed a beautiful canopy over his head, without touching him.

They relate likewise, that a Christian Alehouse-keeper, named St. Theodosius, meeting with a Curate of the name of Fronton, in a meadow near Ancyra. *This meadow*, says Father Bollandus (who collected this legend, and who has placed it under the Emperor Domitian, but without being able to ascertain the year in which it happened) *was of a beautiful verdure, and embellished with a variety of flowers of different hues.* "What a charming situation for a chapel!" exclaimed the holy Alehouse-keeper. "You are in the right," replied the Curate. "But we are in want of reliques." "I will furnish you with them," said the Saint. He well knew what he said. There were at that time in Ancyra seven Christian virgins, each of whom was about seventy-two years of age. They had been condemned by the Governor to be violated by all the young men of the city, according to the Roman laws; for this legend supposes this punishment to have been invariably inflicted on Christian maidens.

There

There was fortunately only one young man in the city who was willing to be their executioner, and he was a sottish rake, who had the courage to attack St. Tecusa, the youngest of the seven, and who was then in her seventy-first year. St. Tecusa threw herself at his feet, and pointing out her age and her wrinkles, at once disarmed the ravisher. The Governor, incensed at seeing these seven old women preserve their chastity, instantly appointed them Priestesses of Diana and Minerva; and they were obliged, continues the legend, to serve those two goddesses naked, though it is well known that women were never permitted to approach the statues of these deities without being covered with a veil from head to feet.

The Alehouse-keeper, Theodosius, seeing them thus exposed, prayed God, with tears in his eyes, to give them up to death. His prayer was heard, and the Governor directed them to be thrown into the Lake of Ancyra, each with a stone to her neck.

The blessed St. Tecusa appeared in the night to the Alehouse-keeper: "My son," said she, "you sleep without thinking of us. Suffer not, I entreat you, my dear Theodosius, our bodies to be eaten by the trouts." Theodosius pondered a whole day on this apparition.

The night following, the Alehouse-keeper went to the lake with some of his servants; a shining light went before them, although the night was dark. A dreadful rain fell and swelled the waters of the lake. Two old men with beards and hair and coats as white as snow appeared before him, and said, "Walk on and fear nothing, for behold the light of heaven is with you, and at the border of the lake you will find a celestial Cavalier compleatly armed, who will conduct you onwards."

At that instant the storm increased. The Cavalier presented himself before them with an enormous lance. He proved to be the glorious martyr Soziander, who
had

had been directed by the Almighty to descend from heaven on a fine horse to conduct the Alehouse-keeper. The centinels of the lake fled before Soziander, who pursued them with his huge lance. Theodosius found the bodies of the seven virgins in the lake, and caused them to be brought out and interred. The legend does not fail to mention the names of all these female martyrs, who were *St. Tecusa*, *St. Alexandra*, *St. Phaina*, Heretics; and *St. Claudia*, *St. Euphrasia*, *St. Matrona*, and *St. Julita*, Catholics.

It was no sooner rumoured in Ancyra, that these seven virgins had been taken out of the lake and interred, than the whole city was in commotion, as may easily be supposed. The Governor ordered Theodosius to be put to the torture. "Behold," said Theodosius, "the gifts which Jesus Christ is pleased to bestow on his followers; he gives me courage to endure the torture, and soon I shall be condemned to the flames." His prophecy was well founded. He died at the stake. But he had promised reliques to the Curate Fronton, who as yet had gotten none for his chapel. Fronton mounting his ass, took with him some bottles of excellent wine, as there was question of an Alehouse-keeper, and sat out towards Ancyra in quest of reliques. In his way thither he met the soldiers who guarded the ashes of Theodosius, and who related to him the martyrdom. He intoxicated them so well with his wine, as to carry off the reliques of the saint, which he buried in his meadow, and there founded his chapel.

The Jesuits, Bollandus and Papebroc, have not been ashamed to relate this idle story in their History of the Saints; and a Monk, named Ruinat, has had the insolent weakness to insert it at length in his Religious Facts. And yet all this variety of imposture, error, and ridiculous nonsense, with which we have been overwhelmed for more than seventeen hundred years, has not been able to injure the cause of our religion; a religion which must certainly be divine,

since seventeen centuries, replete with fraud and absurdity, have not been able to destroy it. Our detestation of falsehood leads us more particularly to reverence the truth.

C H A P. X.

*A farther Account of the Establishment of Christianity.—
How it became the prevailing Religion under Constantine.
—Of the Decline of ancient Rome.*

THE reign of Constantine is a glorious æra for the Christian religion, which he rendered triumphant. There was no necessity for adding prodigies to this revolution, such as the apparition of the Labarum* in the clouds, without informing us in what country this standard appeared. It was needless to assert that they who had the care of the Labarum were invulnerable. The shield which fell from heaven in ancient Rome, the Oriflamme which was brought to St. Denis by an angel, all these imitations of the Palladium of Troy tend only to give a fabulous appearance to truth. Learned antiquarians have sufficiently refuted these errors, which are so repugnant to philosophy and sound criticism. Let us therefore content ourselves with observing in what manner Rome ceased to be Rome.

In order to trace the history of the human understanding among the Christians, it is necessary to ascend to the reign of Constantine, and even beyond that period. But the history of those early ages is veiled with an almost impenetrable obscurity. We

* The name given to the luminous cross which Constantine is said to have seen in the heavens. The military standard used by the Romans after his time was distinguished by the same name. T.

might naturally expect information from such a man as Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea, who was the confidant of Constantine, the enemy of St. Athanasius, a man of weight in the state, a man of letters, and in short the first who wrote the history of the church; but we are astonished when we look into the writings of this father of ecclesiastical history. On the subject of the Emperor Constantine, for instance, we are told that, "God arranged numbers in his unity; that he embellished the world by the number of two, and that by the number three he composed it of matter and form; that having doubled the number two, he formed the four elements; that it is a marvellous thing that by adding together the numbers one, two, three, and four, we have the number of ten, which is the end and ultimate perfection of the unity; and that this number ten, which is so perfect in itself, being multiplied by the number three, which is the image of the divinity, we have the thirty days of the month."*

It is this same Eusebius who quotes the letter we have already spoken of, from Abgarus, King of Edessa, to Jesus Christ, in which he makes him an offer of his little town: he has likewise inserted our Saviour's answer. He likewise relates, after Tertullian, that the moment Tiberius had been informed by Pilate of the death of Jesus Christ, that Emperor, who had driven the Jews out of Rome, proposed it to the senate to place our Saviour among the gods of the empire; that the senate were unwilling to comply with this request, and that Tiberius was extremely offended thereat.

He describes, after St. Justin, the pretended statue which is said to have been raised to Simon the Magician. He pretends, on the testimony of Hege-sippus, that the grandsons of St. Jude were repre-

* See the panegyric of Constantine in the 4th and 5th chapters of Eusebius. V.

sented to the Emperor Domitian, as dangerous persons, who had a natural claim to the throne of David; that the Emperor himself was at the pains to interrogate them, and that these Israelites assured him they were simple peasants, who cultivated with their own hands a field of thirty-nine acres, the only land they were masters of.

He omits no opportunity of slanderer the Romans, because he himself was an Asiatic. He dares to assert, that even in his time the Roman senate sacrificed every year a man to Jupiter. Is it allowable thus to charge the Tituses, the Trajans, the divine Antonines, with an abomination which was perhaps never yet practised by any nation in the known world?

It was in this manner history was written in those times, when the change of religion was beginning to give a new appearance to the Roman empire. Gregory of Tours adhered to the same method; and we may venture to say, that we had no good historians before Guicciardini* and Machiavel†. But the uncouth style and manner, even of the earlier writers, are alone sufficient to give us an idea of the times in which they lived; and there is not one of their books, not even the legends excepted, from which we may not derive some knowledge of the ancient manners of our nations.

Constantine having obtained the imperial dignity in spite of the Romans, could not be beloved by that people. It is evident that the hatred they bore him was not at all abated by the many horrid murders he committed, such as that of Licinius his brother-in-law, contrary to the most solemn engagement; that of Licinian his nephew, a child only twelve years old; that of Maximian his father-in-law, who was strangled

* A celebrated Italian historian, who was born at Florence in 1482, and died in the neighbourhood of that city in 1540. T.

† This famous writer flourished at Florence in the beginning of the 15th century. T.

by his orders at Marseilles; that of his own son Crispus, who was put to death after having gained several victories against his enemies; and in fine that of his wife Fausta, who was smothered in a bath. Probably this was what induced him to transfer the seat of empire to Byzantium. We find an edict of Constantine in the Theodosian code, in which he declares, *that he founded Constantinople by order of God.* Thus he pretended a revelation, to silence all complaints. This act alone is sufficient to shew his character. Our curiosity would feign penetrate into the inmost thoughts of such a prince as Constantine, by whom so general a revolution was made throughout the Roman empire; for he changed the seat of empire, the manners of the court, the customs, language, dress, form of government, and even the established religion. But how can we come at the real character of a person, whom one party represents as the most criminal, and the other as the most virtuous of men? Were we to conclude that he made every thing subservient to what he looked upon as his interest, we should not be mistaken.

To know whether the ruin of the empire was owing to him is a point worthy of our inquiry. It seems evident that he occasioned the downfall of Rome; but by transferring the seat of empire to the Thracian Bosphorus, he raised a barrier in the East against the inroads of barbarians, who over-run the empire under his successors, and found Italy in a defenceless state. He seems to have sacrificed the western empire to the east; for Italy fell when Constantinople rose. The political history of those times would be a curious and instructive study, but we have hardly any thing upon the subject, except satires and panegyrics. And yet sometimes the truth may be discovered even in panegyrics. For instance, Constantine is extolled to the skies for having ordered all the chiefs of the Franks, with all the other prisoners he had made in an expedition towards the Rhine, to be devoured by
wild

wild beasts in the Circus. Such was the way in which the predecessors of Clovis and Charlemagne were treated. Writers who have been so mean as to commend such acts of barbarity, do however ascertain those acts, and the reader is to judge of them as he thinks fit. The most circumstantial part of the history of this revolution, which has been handed down to us, is that which relates to the establishment of the church, and its domestic troubles.

It is a melancholy consideration, that Christianity was no sooner in possession of the throne, than the holiness of this religion was profaned by Christians, who indulged their thirst for revenge, even when their triumph should have inspired them with the love of peace. They massacred all the magistrates in Syria and Palestine, that had been concerned in persecuting them; they drowned the wife and daughter of Maximinus; they put his sons and his relations to death by the most cruel tortures. The disputes about the consubstantiality of the word, disturbed and imbrued the world in blood. In short Ammianus Marcellinus tells us, *that the Christians in his time, tore one another to pieces like wild beasts.* There were, however, many eminent virtues among those people, of which Ammianus takes no notice; so true it is, that mankind are generally blind to the virtues of their enemies, and only observe their vices.

The Church of Rome was preserved from those crimes and misfortunes: in the beginning it was neither powerful nor corrupt; it remained for a long time in a peaceful state, in the midst of a senate and people who were idolaters. In the capital of the known world there were seven hundred temples, great and small, dedicated to the gods *majorum & minorum gentium.* These subsisted till the time of Theodosius; and the country people continued long after that period in their ancient worship. Hence the followers of the old religion came to have the name of Pagans, *Pagani*, from the villages called in Latin

Pagi,

Pagi, in which idolatry was tolerated till the eighth century.

We are now well acquainted with the imposture on which the donation of Constantine was founded ; but we are not so well informed how long this imposture had gained credit. They who decried it, were frequently punished in Italy and elsewhere. Who could imagine that there were people burnt alive at Strasburgh, in 1478, for opposing this error?

Constantine indeed gave, not to the Bishop of Rome only, but to the cathedral, which was the Church of St. John, a thousand marks of gold, and thirty thousand of silver, with a yearly income of fourteen thousand pence, and some lands in Calabria. Succeeding Emperors increased this income, which the Bishops of Rome stood greatly in need of. The missionaries they sent into the Pagan countries in Europe, the asylum they afforded to bishops exiled from their sees, and the maintaining great numbers of poor, laid them under the necessity of having a good revenue to support these expences. The dignity of the appointment being still greater than the revenue, the pastor of the Christians at Rome soon rose to be the most considerable person in the western world. Pious men had often accepted of this office, and the ambitious courted it. The papal chair was contested, and there were Anti-popes, so early as the middle of the fourth century : hence the Pagan Consul Pretextatus expressed himself in these words in 466 ; *Make me Bishop of Rome and I will be a Christian.*

Yet this Bishop had no other authority than that which is derived either from virtue, personal credit, or intrigue in favorable circumstances. Those pastors of the church had no civil jurisdiction, much less the prerogative of sovereigns. None of them had what we call the *jus terrendi*, nor a territorial right, nor the power of pronouncing *do, dico*. The Emperors continued supreme judges of every thing,
matters

matters of faith only excepted. They summoned councils; and Constantine, at that of Nice, heard and tried the accusations, which the Bishops brought against one another. Even the title of Sovereign Pontif was still attached to the Imperial Dignity.

C H A P. XI.

Of the Causes of the Fall of the Roman Empire.

IF any one could have supported the empire, or at least have retarded its fall, it was the Emperor Julian. He was not a soldier of fortune like Dioclesian and Theodosius. Entitled by his birth to the throne, elected by the army, and beloved by all his soldiers, he had nothing to fear from faction. After his victories in Germany he was considered as the greatest captain of his time. No Emperor was more equitable, or distributed justice in a more impartial manner, not even Marcus Aurelius excepted. No philosopher could be more temperate in his mode of living. He therefore reigned not only by virtue of the laws, but by his own bravery and example. If his reign had been of a longer continuance, the empire would probably have been less tottering after his death. Two events at length brought about the destruction of this great colossus, and these were the irruption of the barbarians and disputes about religion.

In regard to the barbarians, it is as difficult to form a clear account of their incursions as of their origin. Procopius and Jornandez, have given us fabulous accounts of this subject which have been copied by all our authors. But who can possibly believe that the Huns came from the North of China, and

and drove before them like flocks of sheep the warlike nations which inhabited the countries now called Crimæa, Poland, the Ukraine, Moldavia and Wallachia. These robust and courageous people were known to the Romans, under the general appellation of Goths. Can it be supposed that these Goths should fly from the borders of the Danube, the moment the Huns made their appearance there? Or, that they should request in a suppliant manner the Romans to give them shelter, and as soon as this was granted them, lay all waste to the very gates of Constantinople?

All this resembles the tales of Herodotus, and the many other tales that have been equally cried up. It is much more likely that all these people came in search of pillage one after the other. The Romans had plundered all the other nations; the Goths and the Huns came to plunder the Romans.

But why did not the Romans exterminate these incroachers, in the same manner as Marius exterminated the Cimbri? It was because there was no longer a Marius to be found among them, because their manners were changed and the empire was divided between Arians and Athanasians. Their attention was confined wholly to two objects, the amusements of the Circus and the doctrine of the Trinity. There were at that time in the Roman Empire a greater number of monks than soldiers, and these monks ran in troops from town to town, supporting or refuting the consubstantiality of the word. There were seventy thousand of them in Egypt.

Christianity opened the gates of heaven, but it occasioned the loss of the empire: for not only the different sects to which it had given birth, combated each other with all the fury of bigotry and enthusiasm, but all united against the ancient religion of the empire; a religion there is no doubt which was

Q

false

false and ridiculous; but under which the Roman arms had been victorious during ten centuries.

The descendants of the Scipio's being degenerated into religious disputants, there being more intrigue for a bishoprick, than had formerly been employed for a triumph, personal regard having passed from the Hortensii and the Cicero's, to the Cyrill's, the Gregory's and the Ambrose's, every thing was lost. If any thing can excite our astonishment, it is that after this the Roman Empire still continued to subsist for a little time.

Theodosius, who has been stiled the Great Theodosius, payed a tribute to the proud Alaric, under the name of a pension from the imperial treasury. Alaric laid Rome under contribution the first time he appeared before its walls, and the second he plundered it. So debased was the state of the empire at that time, that this Goth disdained to be King of Rome, whilst Honorius, the miserable Emperor of the West trembled in Ravenna where he had taken refuge.

Alaric amused himself with creating an Emperor at Rome of the name of Attalus, who came to receive his orders in his antichamber. Historians relate two anecdotes of Honorius, which sufficiently prove the baseness of those times. The first of these is, that one of the causes of the contempt into which he was fallen, was his being impotent; and the other, that it was proposed to the Emperor Attalus, the servant of Alaric, to castrate Honorius in order to render his ignominy compleat.

After Alaric, came Attila who ravaged the empire as far as Gaul. He was so great, and the Emperors Theodosius and Valentinian III. so little, that the Princess Honoria, sister of the latter, offered herself to him in marriage. She sent her ring to him as a pledge of fidelity, but before Attila had returned an answer to her offer, she became pregnant by one of his attendants.

Attila

Attila had no sooner destroyed the City of Aquileia, than Leo, Bishop of Rome, came to throw himself at his feet, with all the gold he had been able to collect as a ransom for the City of Rome, in which the Emperor Valentinian III. had concealed himself. The agreement being concluded, the monks did not fail to assert in their writings that Pope Leo caused Attila to tremble; that he came to him with an air and tone of authority, accompanied by St. Peter and St. Paul, who were armed with two flaming swords. This manner of writing history was adopted without interruption by the Christians till the sixteenth century.

Soon after this a deluge of barbarians poured in on every side, and spread themselves over those countries which had escaped the ravages of Attila.

In the mean time what was the employment of the Emperors? They were busied in assembling religious councils; sometimes on account of the ancient controversy of the followers of St. Athanasius, and sometimes for the Donatists; Africa was in commotion with these disputes when the Vandal Genseric subdued it. Councils were likewise assembled to debate on the arguments of St. Nestorius and St. Cyrill, or on the doctrines of St. Eutychius. In these councils articles of faith were very often decided by blows, as was the case in one assembled at Ephesus under Theodosius the Second. In short, to compleat our picture of those unhappy times, we ought not to omit to mention that an importunate Monk, having one day been rebuked by Theodosius II. he excommunicated the Emperor, who was obliged to make application to the Patriarch of Constantinople to get the excommunication taken off.

During these troubles the Franks invaded Gaul; the Visigoths made themselves masters of Spain; and the Ostrogoths under the reign of Theodosius possessed themselves of Italy, but were soon driven from

thence by the Lombards. The Roman empire in the time of Clovis had no longer any existence except in Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt; all the other parts were fallen a prey to barbarians. Scythians, Vandals, and Franks became Christians, that they might the better govern the Christian provinces they had subjected; for we are not to suppose that these men were without cunning; on the contrary, they possessed it in abundance, and on this head all mankind are nearly equal. These plunderers were therefore converted to Christianity by their interests; but this change served only to increase their inhumanity. Father Daniel, a French historian, who has disguised so many things, does not venture however to deny that Clovis was more blood thirsty, and guilty of much greater crimes after his being baptized than when he was a Pagan. And these crimes were none of those heroic deeds which dazzle human imbecility, but a series of robbery and murder. He bribed a Prince of Cologne to assassinate his father, after which he caused the son to be executed, and killed the petty king of Cambray, who had shewn him his treasures. A private individual for much less offences than these would have been dragged to the gallows, whereas Clovis founded a monarchy.

C H A P. XII.

Continuation of the Decline of the Roman Empire.

WHEN the Goths made themselves masters of Rome after the Heruli, when the celebrated Theodoric, a prince who was as powerful at that time as Charlemagne was afterwards, had fixed the seat of his empire at Ravenna in the beginning of the sixth century, without assuming the title of Emperor of the

the West, which he might have done; he exercised exactly the same authority over the Romans as the Cæsars did: maintaining the senate; allowing liberty of conscience, and making all persuasions, whether orthodox, Arians, or idolaters, submit to the civil government; trying the Goths and the Romans each by their own laws; presiding by his commissaries at the election of bishops; prohibiting simony, and putting a stop to schisms. Two Popes disputed the episcopal chair; he nominated Symmachus, and this Pope being accused of some crime, he ordered him to be tried by his commissaries.

His grandson Athalaric regulated the elections of the Popes, and of all the other metropolitans of his dominions, by an edict which was strictly observed; an edict drawn up by his minister Cassiodorus, who retired afterwards to Mount Cassino, and entered into the order of St. Benedict; an edict to which Pope John II. submitted without difficulty.

When Belisarius came into Italy and replaced it under the imperial power, it is well known that he banished Pope Silverius, and in so doing he did not exceed the limits of his authority, though he might those of justice. Belisarius and Narses having rescued Rome from the Gothic yoke, another inundation of barbarians, Gepids, Franks, and Germans, spread themselves over Italy. The whole western empire was torn and desolated by savages. The Lombards established their dominion in a considerable part of Italy. Albuinus, the founder of that new dynasty, was no more than a barbarous free-booter, but the conquerors soon adopted the polite manners, the language, and religion of the conquered. This was not the case with regard to the Franks and Burgundians, who carried with them into Gaul their barbarous language, and their still more barbarous manners. The Lombard nation was composed of Pagans and Arians. Their king Rotharis published an edict towards the year 640, granting liberty of conscience

to all religions; so that almost in every town in Italy there was a Catholic bishop and an Arian bishop, who suffered the idolaters that were still dispersed in the villages, to live in peace.

The kingdom of Lombardy extended from Piedmont to Brindisi and Otranto: it included Benevento, Bari, and Tarento; but it contained neither Apulia, Rome, nor Ravenna. These countries continued to be annexed to the feeble empire of the East. Thus the Roman church passed from the dominion of the Goths to that of the Greeks. Rome itself was governed by an *Exarch* appointed by the Emperor; but he did not reside in that capital, which was almost deserted. His residence was at Ravenna, from whence he sent his orders to the Duke or Prefect of Rome, and to the senate, who were still called *conscripse fathers*. The appearance of municipal government still subsisted in that ancient and decayed capital, and the republican sentiments were never wholly extinguished. They were supported by the example of Venice, a republic originally founded by fear and distress, but soon raised by commerce and bravery. The Venetians were so powerful in the eighth century, as to restore the Exarch Scholasticus, who had been driven away from Ravenna.

But what was the situation of Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries? That of a poor unhappy city, weakly protected by the Exarchs, continually menaced by the Lombards, and still acknowledging the Emperor for its master. As that capital decayed, the influence of the Popes had increased. They were often the comforters, the fathers of the people; but still they were subjects, and could not be consecrated without the express leave of the Exarch. The form in which this leave was requested and granted is still subsisting. The clergy of Rome wrote to the metropolitan of Ravenna, and desired his protection and interest with the Governor; the Pope afterwards sent his profession of faith to this metropolitan.

At

At length the Lombard king Astolphus seized on the whole exarchate of Ravenna, in 751, and put an end to the imperial viceroyalty, which had lasted an hundred and eighty-three years.

As the duchy of Rome depended on the exarchate of Ravenna, Astolphus laid claim to Rome by right of conquest. Pope Stephen II. the only defender of the unfortunate Romans, applied for succour to the Emperor Constantine, surnamed Copronymus. The only assistance this miserable Emperor afforded, was in deputing an officer belonging to his court with a letter to the King of the Lombards. It was to this weakness of the Greek Emperors, the new empire of the West, and the pontifical grandeur, owed their origin.

Before that period there was no bishop aspired to the least temporal authority, or the least territory; and indeed how could they have dared to do either of these? Their legislator was a poor man, who preached only to the poor. The successors of the primitive Christians were poor likewise. The clergy were not formed into a body till the reign of Constantine the First, but even that Emperor did not suffer a Bishop to be proprietor of a single village. It was not till the times of anarchy that the Popes were able to obtain any domains, and these were of no considerable value or extent. Every thing rises and falls with time.

When we pass on from the history of the Roman empire to the people who desolated it in the West, we are in the situation of a traveller, who after leaving a beautiful city finds himself in a desert covered with briars. Twenty barbarous jargons succeeded to that agreeable Latin language which was spoken from the remotest parts of Illyria to Mount Atlas. Instead of those wise laws by which half our hemisphere was governed, we find only savage customs. The amphitheatres and other public buildings in the several provinces were so many heaps of ruins. Those great roads

roads which were so firm and convenient, and which extended from the foot of the Capitol to Mount Taurus, were covered with stagnant waters. A similar revolution took place in the genius of the people; and St. Gregory of Tours, and Fredegarius the Monk of St. Gal, are our Polybius and our Livy. The human understanding was degraded by the weakest and most ridiculous superstition. This superstition was carried to such a length, that simple Monks rose to be Priests and Sovereigns. They had slaves, and these slaves did not dare to complain. All Europe continued in this disgraceful situation until the sixteenth century, and did not emerge from it even then but by the most dreadful convulsions.

C H A P. XIII.

Origin of the Papal Power.—Digression concerning the Consecration of Kings.—Letter from St. Peter to Pepin King of France.—Pretended Donations to the Holy See.

THERE are only three ways of subduing mankind; one of these is by reducing them to order by means of good laws, another is by calling in the assistance of religion to the support of those laws, the third is by destroying one half of a nation in order to govern the rest; I know not of a fourth. All the three require favourable circumstances. We must go back to the earliest ages to find instances of the first, and these are very doubtful. Charlemagne, Clovis, Theodoric, Albouin, and Alaric, made use of the third, and the second was adopted by the Popes.

The Pope had originally no other pretensions to Rome, than St. Augustine, for example, would have had to the sovereignty of the little town of Hippona. And

And even supposing St. Peter himself to have resided in Rome, as is pretended, because one of his Epistles is dated from Babylon; nay even if he had been Bishop of Rome, at a time when there was certainly no particular see existing, his residence in Rome could by no means entitle him to the throne of the Cæsars: and we have seen that for the space of seven hundred years, the Bishops of Rome considered themselves only as subjects.

Rome so repeatedly plundered by barbarians, forsaken by its Emperors, closely pressed by the Lombards, and incapable of establishing its ancient republic, could no longer have pretensions to grandeur. She stood in need of repose; and this repose she would have enjoyed had she been at that time governed by her Bishop, as many cities in Germany have since been; and anarchy would at least have produced this good effect. But it was not yet a received opinion among Christians, that a bishop could be a sovereign, though the history of the world afforded so many examples of the union between the priesthood and the empire in other religions.

Pope Gregory III. was the first who had recourse to the protection of the Franks against the Lombards and the Emperor. Zachary his successor, animated with the same spirit, acknowledged Pepin, the usurper of the crown of France, as lawful sovereign. It has been pretended that Pepin who was only prime minister, first sent to ask the Pope, which was the true King, he who had only the right and the name, or he who had the authority and merit? And that the Pope determined this question by answering that the minister ought to be King. It has never been proved that this farce was really acted: but it is certain that Pope Stephen III. called Pepin to his assistance against the Lombards; that he came into France, to throw himself at the feet of Pepin, whom he afterwards crowned with the ceremonies which

R

have

have been stiled consecration. This was an imitation of an ancient Jewish ceremony. Samuel poured oil on the head of Saul. The Lombards were likewise consecrated in a similar manner, and this custom had been adopted even by the Dukes of Benevento. Oil was employed in the installation of bishops, and they thought to stamp a character of holiness on the crown, by joining to it an episcopal ceremony. A King of the Goths, named Vamba, was consecrated in Spain with holy oil in 674. But the Arabians when they made themselves masters of that country, neglected this ceremony and the Spaniards have not revived it since.

Pepin was therefore not the first king who was consecrated in Europe, as we see every day asserted in books. He had already received this unction from an English monk, named Boniface, who was a missionary in Germany and Bishop of Mentz, and who having travelled a long time in Lombardy, consecrated him after the manner of that country.

It ought particularly to be mentioned here, that this Boniface had been created Bishop of Mentz by Carloman, brother to the usurper Pepin, without the concurrence of the Pope; nor had the Court of Rome any influence at that time, in the nomination to bishoprics in the Kingdom of France. Nothing can be a more convincing proof that all laws, both civil and ecclesiastical, are dictated by conveniency, maintained by force, destroyed by want of power, and changed by time. The Bishops of Rome pretended to absolute authority, but had it not. The Popes, when under the yoke of the Lombard Kings, would have made over all their ecclesiastical authority in France, to the first Frank who would have delivered them from their subjection in Italy.

Pope Stephen stood in greater need of Pepin, than Pepin did of him; this appears clearly, since it was the priest who came to implore the protection of the

the warrior. The new King caused himself to be again consecrated by the Bishop of Rome in the Church of St. Denis. This fact appears singular, for it is not customary to be crowned twice, when the first ceremony appears to be sufficient. It would seem then, that in the opinion of the people, a Bishop of Rome was something more holy and had greater authority, than a Bishop of Germany; that the monks of St. Denis, in whose church this second consecration took place, considered the oil poured on the head of a Frank by a Roman Bishop, as of greater efficacy than the oil used by a missionary of Mentz; and that the successor of St. Peter, had more than any other the power of making an usurpation lawful.

Pepin was the first King consecrated in France, though not the only one who has been anointed by the hands of a Roman Pontiff: for Innocent III. afterwards crowned and anointed Lewis the Young at Rheims, Clovis was neither crowned nor consecrated by Bishop Remi. He had reigned many years before he was baptized. If he had received the royal unction, his successors would have adopted a ceremony which was of itself so solemn, and which soon became so necessary. No monarch had been anointed before Pepin, who underwent this ceremony in the Abbey of St. Denis. It was not till three hundred years after Clovis, that Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, asserted in his writings, that a pigeon had brought from heaven a phial called the holy ampulla. Perhaps by this fabulous story, he thought to strengthen the right of consecrating kings, which the Archbishops of Rheims had begun to exercise not long before this. This privilege however, was confirmed only by length of time, like all other customs; and these prelates did for a considerable time afterwards anoint all the Kings from Philip I. to Henry. IV. who was crowned at Chartres, and anointed with the ampulla of St. Martin, because the

Leaguers were at that time in possession of the ampulla of St. Remi.

It is true, these ceremonies add nothing to the right of kings, but they seem to encrease the veneration of the people.

There is no doubt that this ceremony of consecration, as well as the custom of carrying the Kings of the Franks, Goths and Lombards on a shield, came originally from Constantinople. The Emperor Cantacuzenes informs us himself, that from time immemorial it had been a practice for the Emperor to be borne on a shield by the great officers of the empire and by the Patriarch; after which the Emperor ascended from his throne to a pulpit in the church, where the Patriarch made the sign of the cross on his head with a feather dipt in consecrated oil. The crown being then brought by the deacons, a principal officer of the state, or a prince of the imperial blood placed it on the head of the new Cæsar.

On these occasions the Patriarch and the people cried out "he is worthy;" but at the consecration of the kings of the west, the Bishop addressed himself to the people saying, "Will you accept this person for your King?" And then the new sovereign took an oath to the people, after having taken it to the Bishops.

Pope Stephen did not content himself with simply consecrating Pepin, but forbade the French, under pain of excommunication, ever to chuse a King of another race. While this Bishop expelled from Italy, and forced to be a suppliant in a foreign country, had the courage to give laws; his policy made him assume an authority which secured that of Pepin's: and this Prince the better to enjoy what was not his due, left the Pope privileges which he had no right to possess.

Conrad in Germany, and Hugh Capet in France, have since shewn that an excommunication of that kind is not a fundamental law.

The

The prejudice of opinion, however, which governs the world, imprinted such a respect in the minds of the people for the ceremony which the Pope performed at St. Denis, that Eginhardus, secretary to Charlemagne, says in express terms, that *King Hilderic was deposed by order of Pope Stephen.*

All the events of those times were a continued series of injustice, rapine, and impostures. An head servant of a King of France deposed his master, Hilderic III. confined him in the prison of St. Bertin, kept his master's son a prisoner in the convent of Fontenelle in Normandy, and a Pope came from Rome to sanctify this injustice.

It would seem to be a contradiction that this Pope should come to France, in order to prostrate himself at Pepin's feet, and afterwards dispose of his crown: but it is far otherwise; those prostrations were looked upon in no other light than as our bows are at present. This was the ancient custom of the East. They saluted the Bishops on their knees, and the Bishops paid the same compliment to the governors of their dioceses. Charles, the son of Pepin, had embraced Pope Stephen's feet at St. Maurice in Valais, and Stephen embraced those of Pepin. This was a matter of no consequence; but by degrees the Popes assumed this mark of respect to themselves alone. Some pretend that Pope Adrian I. was he who insisted on the ceremony of kissing his feet. Emperors and Kings submitted afterwards to this kind of homage, which rendered the Roman religion more venerable in the eyes of the people.

Historians inform us, that Pepin passed the Alps in 754; that Astolphus, King of the Lombards, intimidated merely by the presence of the King of the Franks, immediately relinquished the whole exarchate of Ravenna to the Pope; that Pepin repassed the mountains, and that he was hardly returned, when Astolphus, instead of giving Ravenna to the Pope, laid

laid

The

laid siege to Rome. All the occurrences of those times were so very irregular, that it is possible Pepin might make a present to the Pope of the exarchate of Ravenna, which did not belong to him; and he might have made this extraordinary donation without taking any measure to put it in execution: yet it is not at all probable that such a man as Pepin, who had dethroned his King, should march with an army into Italy to make presents. There is nothing more uncertain than this grant which has been quoted in so many books. Anastasius the bibliothecarian, who wrote 140 years after Pepin's expedition, is the first that mentions it. I am aware that a thousand authors take notice of it, but the best civilians at present in Germany concur in denying the fact.

There prevailed about that time an odd mixture of policy and simplicity, of awkwardness and cunning, which strongly characterizes the general decline. Stephen feigned a letter from St. Peter, addressed from Heaven to Pepin and his sons, which deserves to be inserted here; it is as follows: "Peter, called an
 " Apostle by Jesus Christ son of the living God, &c.
 " As through me the whole catholic, apostolic, and
 " Roman church, the mother of all other churches,
 " is founded on a rock, and to the end that Stephen
 " Bishop of this beloved church of Rome—and that
 " virtue and power may be granted by our Lord to
 " rescue the church of God out of the hands of its
 " persecutors: To you most excellent Princes, Pepin,
 " Charles, and Carloman, and to all the holy Bishops
 " and Abbots, Priests, and Monks, as also to Dukes,
 " Counts, and people, I Peter the Apostle, &c. I
 " conjure you; and the Virgin Mary, who will be
 " obliged to you, gives you notice, and commands
 " you, as do also the thrones, dominations.... If
 " you will not fight for me, I declare to you by the
 " Holy Trinity, and by my apostleship, that you shall
 " have no share in paradise."

This

This letter had its effect: Pepin passed the Alps a second time, laid siege to Pavia, and concluded a peace once more with Astolphus. But is it probable that he should pass the Alps twice merely to give away towns to Pope Stephen? How comes it that St. Peter in his letter makes no mention of so important a fact? Why does not he complain to Pepin of not being in possession of the exarchate? Why does not he require it to be restored again in express terms?

It is certain however that the Franks, after having conquered the Gauls, were desirous of subduing Italy likewise; a country which had been the favourite object of all the barbarians: not that Italy was in itself a better country than Gaul, but at that time it was better cultivated; the towns and cities which had been built, enlarged, or embellished by the Romans still subsisted, and the reputation of Italy had always been a temptation for a poor, restless, and warlike people. If Pepin had been able to conquer Lombardy, as Charlemagne did, he would undoubtedly have done it; and if he did conclude a treaty with Astolphus, it was because he was obliged to it. He had usurped a throne, in which he was not yet sufficiently established, and had to contend with the Dukes of Aquitaine and Gascony, whose rights to those countries were much better founded than his own were to France. How then could he have given so much territory to the Popes, when he was forced to return back to France to support his reputation there?

As the original title of this donation has never appeared, we are obliged to doubt. This is very often the only resource we have left in history as well as in philosophy. The Holy See however does not stand in need of any such equivocal titles; time hath given it as undoubted a right to its dominions, as the other Princes of Europe have to theirs. It is certain that the Roman Pontifs had
large

large patrimonies at that time in more countries than one; that those patrimonies were respected, and exempted from taxes. They had estates in the Alps, in Tuscany, Spoleto, Gaul, Sicily, and even in Corsica, before the Arabians made themselves masters of that island in the eighth century. It is probable that Pepin made a great addition to this patrimony in the province of Romagna, and that it was called the patrimony of the exarchate. Probably this word *patrimony* was the original cause of the mistake. The earlier writers, in times of darkness, supposed that the Popes had been sovereigns of those countries, in which they possessed some towns or estates.

If any Pope, towards the end of the eighth century, pretended to rank as a sovereign Prince, it seems to have been Adrian I. The money coined in his name (if this coin was really struck in his time) shews that he had the prerogative of sovereignty; and the custom he introduced of making people kiss his feet, corroborates the conjecture. Yet he constantly acknowledged the Greek Emperor for his master. He might easily pay an empty homage to that distant sovereign, and yet claim a real independence supported by the authority of his office in the church.

Observe the different gradations by which the Roman Pontiffs rose to power. The first Bishops were indigent persons, who preached to people as poor as themselves in the cellars of Rome. At the end of two centuries we find them at the head of a considerable flock; under Constantine they were rich and respected; they became Patriarchs of the West; they acquired an immense revenue and a considerable territory, and at length we see them become powerful sovereigns. Thus have almost all things deviated from their origin. Were the founders of Rome, of the Chinese empire, and of that of the Caliphs, to return again into the world, they would see their thrones filled by Goths, Tartars, and Turks. Before we

w
p
p
E
co

of

I
diff
the
chu
wer
and
diff
two
men
gro
who
plur
who
tro
was
T
cord
East
sover
bles,
those
from
their
An
starte

we proceed to inquire how a total revolution was produced in the West by the translation of the empire, it will be necessary to give you an idea of the Eastern Church, the disputes of which did not a little contribute to this great revolution.

C H A P. XIV.

*Of the State of the Eastern Church before Charlemagne,
and of the Disputes about Images.*

IT is not my intention to examine whether the customs of the Greek and Latin churches were as different as their languages; whether their liturgy, their vestments, the ornaments and structure of their churches, and their manner of making the cross were the same, or whether the Greeks prayed standing and the Latins in a kneeling posture. None of these different customs were the causes of the disputes between the East and West. They only served to foment the natural aversion between nations that were grown rivals to each other. The Greeks especially, who were always christened by immersion, or by plunging into large baptizing tubs, hated the Latins who, in favour of the northern Christians, had introduced baptism by sprinkling; but this difference was productive of no disturbance.

Temporal dominion, that perpetual source of discord in the West, was altogether unknown to the Eastern Church. The Bishops, under the eye of their sovereign, continued to be subjects; but other troubles, of no less fatal consequence, were excited by those endless disputes which sprang up continually from the sophistical disposition of the Greeks and their disciples.

Amidst the multiplicity of questions which were started by human curiosity, the simplicity of the primitive

mitive ages disappeared; for the founder of the Christian religion having wrote nothing, and mankind being impatient to know every thing, each mystery gave rise to different opinions, and each opinion was productive of bloodshed.

It seems very remarkable that out of near fourscore sects, which had rent the church since its first establishment, not one was founded by a Roman, except Novatianus, who can hardly be considered as an heretic. During the first five ages we do not find the name of a single Roman mentioned, either as a father of the church, or as a leader of any of the different sects. And of all the Bishops of Rome, there was only one that favoured any of those systems condemned by the church. This was Pope Honorius I. who is charged to this day with having been a Monothelift.* They think to stigmatize his memory by this accusation; but whoever will be at the pains to peruse his famous pastoral letter, in which he attributes but one will to Jesus Christ, will find him a man of great prudence. *We acknowledge, says he, but one will in Christ. We do not perceive that either councils or scripture authorize us to think otherwise; but whether, in consequence of the works of the divine and human nature with which he is invested, we ought to understand one operation or two, is a matter I leave to grammarians, as being but of little importance.*

Perhaps in all the letters of the Popes, there is nothing more valuable than these expressions. They are sufficient to convince us, that all the disputes of the Greeks were disputes about words; and that they ought to have silenced those sophistical quarrels, which have been attended with such fatal consequences. Had they followed the advice of this judicious Pontiff, by leaving them to grammarians, the

* The Monothelists were a sect who maintained, that although there are *two natures*, there is only *one will* in Christ. T.

church would have enjoyed a constant peace. But were they to decide the question, whether the Son was consubstantial with the Father, or of an inferior nature? the Christian world was divided, and one half persecuted the other. Were they desirous of knowing whether the mother of Jesus Christ was the mother of God, or of Jesus? Whether Christ had two natures and two wills united in one and the same person, or two persons and one will, or one will and one person? All these disputes, which arose in Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, excited seditions: one party anathematized the other; and the ruling faction condemned to exile, to prison, to death, and to eternal torments after death those of the opposite sect, who in their turn revenged themselves in the same manner.

Similar troubles had never been known in the days of Paganism; and the reason of this was, because the Pagans, though involved in the grossest errors, had no intricate religious doctrines, and because their priests, much less the laity, never assembled to dispute on subjects of religion in a judicial manner.

It was debated in the Eastern Church in the eighth century, whether religious worship ought to be paid to images: this had been expressly forbidden by the law of Moses, a law that had never been repealed; and the primitive Christians for more than two hundred years, had never suffered them to be placed in their assemblies.

At length by degrees, a custom was every where introduced of having crucifixes in private houses; and at length people had pictures, either true, or what were pretended to be so, of martyrs or confessors. As yet however, there were no altars erected to the saints, or any masses celebrated in their name: only at the sight of a crucifix, or of the image of a good man, the heart, which more particularly in

those climates stands in need of sensible objects, felt itself excited to piety.

This custom afterwards made its way into the churches: but there were some Bishops who refused to adopt it. We are told that in 393, St. Epiphanius pulled down an image in a church in Syria, before which the people were praying: he declared, that the Christian religion did not permit a worship of that kind, and yet his severity was in no degree the cause of schism.

At length this pious practice, like all other human things, degenerated into an abuse. The vulgar, who are ever gross in their ideas, made no distinction between God and the images: they soon proceeded so far as to attribute to them virtues and miracles; each image cured some particular disease: they even used them in superstitious divinations, which have always seduced the credulity of the vulgar; I do not mean the vulgar among the common people only, but those among Princes and men of learning.

In 727, the Emperor Leo, the Isaurian, at the instigation of certain Bishops endeavoured to remedy this abuse; but in so doing he committed perhaps a still greater error, by defacing all the paintings, and removing at once all the statues and representations of Christ and the Saints. In this manner, he exasperated the people by suddenly removing the objects of their worship; they disobeyed his orders and even revolted; the Emperor commenced a persecution, and thus became a tyrant merely because he had been imprudent.

It is disgraceful to the age we live in, that there should still be compilers ignorant enough to repeat an old and idle story about two Jews, who are said to have predicted the empire to Leo, and to have required of him that he should abolish the worship of images; as if it could have been a matter of any consequence to the Jews, whether the Christians had any images in their churches or not. Historians
who

who can thus believe it possible to foretel what is to come, are altogether unworthy of recording that which is past.

His son, Constantine Copronymus, enacted a civil and ecclesiastical law for the abolition of images. He held a council of three hundred and thirty-eight Bishops at Constantinople, who unanimously condemned this worship which had been adopted by many churches, and particularly by that of Rome.

This Emperor thought with as little difficulty to have abolished the Monks, whom he held in detestation, and to whom he never gave any other appellation than that of *the abominables*; but in this attempt he was unable to succeed; these Monks, who were already very rich, having defended their estates with much greater art than they had the images of their saints.

The Popes Gregory II. and III. and their successors, though secret enemies of the Emperors, and avowed adversaries to their doctrine, did not, however, level against them those heavy excommunications, that have since been so frequently employed, even on the slightest occasion: but whether an ancient respect for the successors of the Cæsars still restrained the metropolitans of Rome, or whether, as is most probable, they saw how much those excommunications, interdictions, and dispensations of oaths of allegiance, would be despised at Constantinople, where the patriarchal church was at least equal to that of Rome, they contented themselves with holding two councils, in 728 and 732, in which it was resolved, that all who were enemies to images should be excommunicated, without adding any thing more, or even mentioning the Emperor. The Popes at that time would seem to have been more intent on negotiating than disputing, Gregory II. procured the management of affairs in Rome, while the people continued in their revolt against the Emperor, and ceased to pay him any tribute. Gregory III. conducted

conducted himself according to the same principles. Some Greek writers of a later date, in order to render the Pontiffs odious, have asserted that Gregory II. excommunicated and deposed the Emperor, and that the whole City of Rome acknowledged Gregory II. for their sovereign. Those Greeks did not reflect that the Popes, whom they would fain have represented as usurpers, would in that case have been the most rightful Princes. They would have held their power by the free choice of the people of Rome. They would have been sovereigns of that capital by a much juster title than a great many Emperors. But it is neither probable, nor true, that the Romans, while they were menaced by Leo the Isaurian, and hard pressed by the Lombards, should chuse a Bishop for their sole master, when they stood in need of a warrior. Had the Popes at that time acquired so just a right to the throne of the Cæsars, they would not have transferred it afterwards to Charlemagne.

C H A P. XV.

Of Charlemagne.—His Ambition and Politics.—Deprives his Nephews of their Possessions.—Of the Oppression and Conversion of the Saxons, &c.

THE Kingdom of Pepin, or Pipin, extended from Bavaria to the Pyrenean Mountains and the Alps. Karl, his son, whom we distinguish by the name of *Charlemagne*, became possessed of the whole of this succession, for one of his brothers died after it was shared between them, and the other had before entered into the Monastery of St. Sylvester and embraced a religious life. A species of piety, agreeable to the barbarism of those times, had confined more than one prince to the cloister: thus

Rachis,

Rachis, King of the Lombards; Carloman, the brother of Pepin; and a Duke of Aquitain, had taken the habit of the Benedictines, which was then almost the only order in the West. The convents at that time were rich, powerful, and respected; they were honourable asylums for those who desired to live a peaceful life: but soon after, these asylums became the prisons of dethroned Princes.

The reputation of Charlemagne is one of the strongest proofs, that success confers glory, and gives a sanction to injustice. His father, Pepin, at his death, had divided his dominions between his two sons Carloman and Karl. This will had been ratified in a solemn assembly of the nation. Carloman had Provence, Languedoc, Burgundy, Switzerland and Alsace, and some other neighbouring countries; Karl, or Charles, enjoyed all the rest. The two brothers were always in a state of variance with each other. Carloman died suddenly and left a widow and two children very young. Charles immediately seized upon their patrimony, and the widow was obliged to fly with her children for refuge to the Court of Desiderius, whom we call Didier, King of the Lombards, who was a natural enemy to the Franks. This Didier was father-in-law to Charlemagne, whom he at once feared and hated. It is certain that Charlemagne had no greater regard to the laws of nature and the ties of blood than other conquerors.

His father, Pepin, however, was very far from having the direct property of all the states of which Charlemagne became possessed: Aquitain, Bavaria, Provence, and Britany, were countries lately conquered, which rendered homage, and paid tribute.

The Northern Germans and the Saracens were two neighbours capable of being formidable to this vast empire. England, which had been conquered by the Anglo-Saxons, and divided into seven kingdoms, being always at war with Albania, now called Scotland,

land, and with the Danes, had neither civil polity nor power. Italy, torn and weakened, was in a situation incapable of resistance.

The inhabitants of the northern parts of Germany were at that time called Saxons; a name given to all the nations who dwelt on the banks of the Weser and the Elbe, from Hamburgh to Moravia, and from the Lower Rhine to the Baltick Sea. They, as well as all the North, were Pagans: their manners and laws were the same as in the times of the ancient Romans: each canton was a republic, but they elected a chief in time of war; their laws were simple as well as their manners; their religion was barbarous; in times of imminent danger they, like many other nations, sacrificed human victims to the Deity; it is the character of barbarians to represent the Deity as a malevolent being, for men make God after their own image. The French, though Christians, had this horrible superstition in the reign of Theodebert. If we are to credit Procopius, human victims were sacrificed even in Italy; and you well know that too many other nations, as well as the Jews, had committed these profanations through piety.

In other respects the Saxons had preserved the manners of the ancient Germans, their simplicity, superstition and poverty. Some cantons were more particularly attached than others to a love of pillage, but they all agreed in placing their happiness and glory in their liberty. These are they who under the names of the Catti, the Cherusci, and the Bructeri, conquered Varus, and were afterwards defeated by Germanicus.

Towards the fifth century, some part of these people being called over by the Britons to assist them against the Scots, they subdued Britain, and gave it the name of England. They had already passed over into that country so early as the third century; for in the time of Constantine part of this island was called the Saxon coast.

Charlemagne,

Charlemagne, the most ambitious, the most politic, and the greatest warrior of his age, carried on a war of thirty years against the Saxons, before he entirely brought them into subjection. Their country had as yet none of those objects which in these days excite the avarice of conquerors. The rich mines of Goslar and Friedberg, from which such quantities of silver have been drawn, were not then discovered; these were unknown till the reign of Henry the Fowler. They had no riches accumulated by long industry; no city worthy the ambition of an usurper. There could be no other view in this conquest than that of reducing to slavery millions of men who cultivated the earth under a severe climate, who fed their flocks, and were resolved to have no masters.

The war against the Saxons was begun on account of a tribute of three hundred horses and of some cows which Pepin had required of them; and this war lasted thirty years. What right had the Franks over those people? The same as the Saxons had heretofore over England.

They were badly armed; for we find in the capitularies of Charlemagne a strict prohibition against selling cuirasses to the Saxons. This difference of opinion, added to discipline, had made the Romans the conquerors of so many nations; and this at last enabled Charlemagne to triumph over the Saxons.

The General of the greatest part of those people was the famous Witikind, from whom the principal families in the empire claim their descent. He in many respects resembled Arminius, but at length behaved with greater weakness. Charlemagne began with taking the famous village of Eresbourg in 772; for that place did not deserve the name either of a town or fortress. He caused the inhabitants to be murdered; he pillaged, and at last rased the principal temple in the country, originally built for the worship of the God Tanfana, the universal principle, if it could be said that those savages had ever any know-

T

ledge

land, and with the Danes, had neither civil polity nor power. Italy, torn and weakened, was in a situation incapable of resistance.

The inhabitants of the northern parts of Germany were at that time called Saxons; a name given to all the nations who dwelt on the banks of the Weser and the Elbe, from Hamburgh to Moravia, and from the Lower Rhine to the Baltick Sea. They, as well as all the North, were Pagans: their manners and laws were the same as in the times of the ancient Romans: each canton was a republic, but they elected a chief in time of war; their laws were simple as well as their manners; their religion was barbarous; in times of imminent danger they, like many other nations, sacrificed human victims to the Deity; it is the character of barbarians to represent the Deity as a malevolent being, for men make God after their own image. The French, though Christians, had this horrible superstition in the reign of Theodebert. If we are to credit Procopius, human victims were sacrificed even in Italy; and you well know that too many other nations, as well as the Jews, had committed these profanations through piety.

In other respects the Saxons had preserved the manners of the ancient Germans, their simplicity, superstition and poverty. Some cantons were more particularly attached than others to a love of pillage, but they all agreed in placing their happiness and glory in their liberty. These are they who under the names of the Catti, the Cherusci, and the Bructeri, conquered Varus, and were afterwards defeated by Germanicus.

Towards the fifth century, some part of these people being called over by the Britons to assist them against the Scots, they subdued Britain, and gave it the name of England. They had already passed over into that country so early as the third century; for in the time of Constantine part of this island was called the Saxon coast.

Charlemagne,

Charlemagne, the most ambitious, the most politic, and the greatest warrior of his age, carried on a war of thirty years against the Saxons, before he entirely brought them into subjection. Their country had as yet none of those objects which in these days excite the avarice of conquerors. The rich mines of Goslar and Friedberg, from which such quantities of silver have been drawn, were not then discovered; these were unknown till the reign of Henry the Fowler. They had no riches accumulated by long industry; no city worthy the ambition of an usurper. There could be no other view in this conquest than that of reducing to slavery millions of men who cultivated the earth under a severe climate, who fed their flocks, and were resolved to have no masters.

The war against the Saxons was begun on account of a tribute of three hundred horses and of some cows which Pepin had required of them; and this war lasted thirty years. What right had the Franks over those people? The same as the Saxons had heretofore over England.

They were badly armed; for we find in the capitularies of Charlemagne a strict prohibition against selling cuirasses to the Saxons. This difference of opinion, added to discipline, had made the Romans the conquerors of so many nations; and this at last enabled Charlemagne to triumph over the Saxons.

The General of the greatest part of those people was the famous Witikind, from whom the principal families in the empire claim their descent. He in many respects resembled Arminius, but at length behaved with greater weakness. Charlemagne began with taking the famous village of Eresbourg in 772; for that place did not deserve the name either of a town or fortress. He caused the inhabitants to be murdered; he pillaged, and at last rased the principal temple in the country, originally built for the worship of the God Tanfana, the universal principle, if it could be said that those savages had ever any know-

T

ledge

ledge of an universal principle. It was at that time dedicated to the God Irminful; whether this was the God of War, the *Ares* of the Greeks, the *Mars* of the Romans; or whether it was consecrated to the famous Herman Arminius, vanquisher of Varus, and avenger of the Germanic liberty.

Charlemagne directed the priests to be massacred on the ruins of the idol; and then penetrated with his victorious army as far as the Wefer, and all the cantons submitted. He resolved to bind them to his yoke by Christianity; and while he marched to the other end of his dominions in search of new conquests, he left missionaries to persuade and soldiers to force them. Thus within the space of a year almost all those that dwelt near the Wefer found themselves Christians, but slaves.

Witikind retired amongst the Danes, who already trembled for their liberty and their gods; but returning a few years after, he assembled his countrymen together, and revived their courage. He found in Bremen, the capital of the country that now bears that name, a Bishop, a church, and his distressed Saxons, who were dragged to the new altars. He drove away the Bishop, who had time to fly and embark; destroyed Christianity, which the people had been forced to embrace; and marched almost to the Rhine, followed by a multitude of Germans, where he defeated Charlemagne's lieutenants.

This Prince soon flew to their assistance, and defeated Witikind in his turn, but treated this courageous effort in behalf of liberty, as a revolt; he ordered the trembling Saxons to deliver up their General, and on being informed that they had suffered him to return into Denmark, he massacred four thousand five hundred prisoners on the banks of the little river Aller. If these prisoners had been his rebellious subjects, still such a chastisement would have been an horrid act of severity; but to treat in this manner men who fought for their liberties and laws, was the

action

action of a robber; and yet his victories, and some shining qualities in other respects, have given him the reputation of a great man.

He did not succeed however in making these people submit to his yoke till he had obtained three victories more, and then Christianity and slavery were cemented by blood. Witikind himself, wearied out by his misfortunes, was obliged to submit to baptism, and to live from thenceforward tributary to his conqueror.

Charlemagne, the better to secure the possession of these countries, transported about ten thousand Saxon families into Flanders, France, and Rome, and established colonies of Franks in the lands of the conquered. We meet with no instance of any prince, since his time, thus transporting his subjects without their consent. You may read of great emigrations, but of no sovereign who thus established colonies according to the method practised by the ancient Romans. The forcing men in this manner to quit the place of their nativity, is at once a proof of the policy and excess of despotic power. Charlemagne added to this policy the cruelty of causing those Saxons to be poniarded by spies, who were found disposed to return to their former worship. The generality of conquerors are cruel only in war; peace usually brings with it milder manners and laws, but Charlemagne, on the contrary, instituted laws which partook of the inhumanity of his conquests.

Having seen how this conqueror treated the Germans, let us observe how he behaved towards the Arabians in Spain. The same thing had already happened amongst them as took place soon afterwards in Italy, Germany, and France: the Governors rendered themselves independent. The Emirs of Barcelona, and those of Saragosa, put themselves under Pepin's protection; and the Emir of Saragosa, in the year 778, came as far as Paderborn to entreat Charlemagne to support him against his sovereign;

when the French Prince espoused the part of the Mussulman, but never thought of making him a Christian. Other interests produced other cares; he entered into an alliance with Saracens against Saracens; but after some advantages obtained on the frontiers of Spain, his rear-guard was defeated at Roncevaux, near the Pyrenean mountains, by the Christians themselves of those mountains, in conjunction with the Mussulmen. In this engagement Roland his nephew perished.

This misfortune gave rise to those fables which were written by a Monk in the eleventh century, under the name of the Archbishop Turpin, and which were afterwards embellished by the imagination of Ariosto.* Historians are silent as to the time at which Charlemagne experienced this disgrace, nor are we told that he revenged it. Satisfied with securing his frontiers against enemies who were but too well skilled in war, he confined his views to such possessions as he was able to maintain, and regulated his ambition by such circumstances as were favourable to it.

C H A P. XVI.

Charlemagne, Emperor of the West.

IT was to Rome and the empire of the West that the ambition of Charlemagne aspired. The power of the Kings of Lombardy was the only obstacle; for the Church of Rome, and all the churches on which she had an influence; the Monks, who were already powerful; and the people, who were now governed by them, all invited Charlemagne to the empire of Rome. Pope Adrian, a Roman by birth, and a man of art and

* In his celebrated poem of *Orlando Furioso*. The work ascribed to Turpin is intitled, *Historia de Vita Caroli Magni & Rolandi*. T.

abilities, smoothed the road to it: he began with prevailing on him to repudiate the daughter of Desiderius, King of Lombardy, at whose court the unfortunate sister-in-law of Charles had taken refuge with her children.

The manners and laws of those days were not very severe, at least with regard to princes. Charles had married this daughter of the King of Lombardy, when he was said to have another wife. And indeed it was not unusual to have several wives at the same time. Gregory of Tours relates that the Kings Gontran, Corbert, Sigebert, and Chilperic had more than one wife. Charles repudiated the daughter of Desiderius, without giving any reason for it, and without any ceremony.

The King of the Lombards, who perceived this fatal union of the King and the Pope against him, took a courageous resolution: he determined to surprise Rome, and seize the Pope's person; but the artful Bishop turned the war into a negotiation. Charlemagne sent ambassadors in order to gain time, who in his name demanded his sister-in-law and his two nephews to be given up to him. Desiderius not only refused to comply with his request, but resolved to restore the two young Princes to their inheritance. Charlemagne came from Thionville to Geneva, where he held one of those parliaments which in every country have invariably subscribed to the will of an artful conqueror. He passed Mount Cenis, and entered Lombardy. Desiderius, after several defeats, shut himself up in Pavia, his capital, which Charlemagne besieged in the midst of winter. The city being reduced to extremity, surrendered after a siege of six months. Thus ended the kingdom of the Lombards, who had destroyed the Roman power in Italy, and substituted their own laws in the room of those of the emperors. Desiderius, the last of these kings, was carried into France and confined in a monastery in the city of Corbie, where he lived
and

when the French Prince espoused the part of the Mussulman, but never thought of making him a Christian. Other interests produced other cares; he entered into an alliance with Saracens against Saracens; but after some advantages obtained on the frontiers of Spain, his rear-guard was defeated at Roncevaux, near the Pyrenean mountains, by the Christians themselves of those mountains, in conjunction with the Mussulmen. In this engagement Roland his nephew perished.

This misfortune gave rise to those fables which were written by a Monk in the eleventh century, under the name of the Archbishop Turpin, and which were afterwards embellished by the imagination of Ariosto.* Historians are silent as to the time at which Charlemagne experienced this disgrace, nor are we told that he revenged it. Satisfied with securing his frontiers against enemies who were but too well skilled in war, he confined his views to such possessions as he was able to maintain, and regulated his ambition by such circumstances as were favourable to it.

C H A P. XVI.

Charlemagne, Emperor of the West.

IT was to Rome and the empire of the West that the ambition of Charlemagne aspired. The power of the Kings of Lombardy was the only obstacle; for the Church of Rome, and all the churches on which she had an influence; the Monks, who were already powerful; and the people, who were now governed by them, all invited Charlemagne to the empire of Rome. Pope Adrian, a Roman by birth, and a man of art and

* In his celebrated poem of *Orlando Furioso*. The work ascribed to Turpin is intitled, *Historia de Vita Caroli Magni & Rolandi*. T.

abilities, smoothed the road to it: he began with prevailing on him to repudiate the daughter of Desiderius, King of Lombardy, at whose court the unfortunate sister-in-law of Charles had taken refuge with her children.

The manners and laws of those days were not very severe, at least with regard to princes. Charles had married this daughter of the King of Lombardy, when he was said to have another wife. And indeed it was not unusual to have several wives at the same time. Gregory of Tours relates that the Kings Gontran, Corbert, Sigebert, and Chilperic had more than one wife. Charles repudiated the daughter of Desiderius, without giving any reason for it, and without any ceremony.

The King of the Lombards, who perceived this fatal union of the King and the Pope against him, took a courageous resolution: he determined to surprise Rome, and seize the Pope's person; but the artful Bishop turned the war into a negotiation. Charlemagne sent ambassadors in order to gain time, who in his name demanded his sister-in-law and his two nephews to be given up to him. Desiderius not only refused to comply with his request, but resolved to restore the two young Princes to their inheritance. Charlemagne came from Thionville to Geneva, where he held one of those parliaments which in every country have invariably subscribed to the will of an artful conqueror. He passed Mount Cenis, and entered Lombardy. Desiderius, after several defeats, shut himself up in Pavia, his capital, which Charlemagne besieged in the midst of winter. The city being reduced to extremity, surrendered after a siege of six months. Thus ended the kingdom of the Lombards, who had destroyed the Roman power in Italy, and substituted their own laws in the room of those of the emperors. Desiderius, the last of these kings, was carried into France and confined in a monastery in the city of Corbie, where he lived
and

and died a captive and a monk; while his son applied in vain for assistance to Constantinople, that shadow of the Roman Empire, which had in the West been destroyed by his ancestors. It ought to be observed, that Desiderius was not the only Prince confined by Charlemagne; for he treated in the same manner a Duke of Bavaria and his children.

The sister-in-law of Charles and her two children, were delivered into the hands of the conqueror. History does not inform us whether they were likewise confined in a monastery or put to death.

Charlemagne did not as yet venture to declare himself sovereign of Rome; and therefore he only assumed the title of King of Italy, a title that had been borne by the Lombards. He was crowned, like them, at Pavia with an iron crown, which is still kept in the little Town of Monza: justice was still administered at Rome in the name of the Greek Emperor: and the Popes themselves received from him the confirmation of their election.

It was usual for the senate to write to the Emperor, or the Exarch of Ravenna when there was one, "We humbly pray that you will order the consecration of our Father and Pastor." Another letter was sent to the Metropolitan of Ravenna. The newly elected Pope was obliged to pronounce two confessions of faith. How different was this from the authority of the triple crown! but where is that grandeur which may not be traced back to as low a beginning?

Charlemagne therefore, like Pepin, only took the title of Patrician, which Theodoric and Attila had also condescended to take: so that this name of Emperor, which originally implied only the general of an army, still signified the master of the East and West. Vain as this title was, they treated it with respect, feared to usurp it, and only affected to make use of that of Patrician, which formerly meant a Roman Senator.

The

The Popes, though they were already very powerful in the Church, though they were great Lords at Rome, and possessed several estates, had however only a precarious and tottering authority in that capital. The prefect, the people, and the senate, the shadow of which still subsisted, frequently opposed them; and the enmity between the families who had pretensions to the pontificate, filled the city with confusion.

The two nephews of Adrian conspired against Leo III. his successor, who had been elected Pope according to custom, by the people and clergy of Rome. They accused him of many crimes, they exasperated the Romans against him, dragged him to prison, and treated most cruelly the man, who every where but at Rome was so much respected. However, he made his escape, and fled to Paderborn, to throw himself on his knees before the Patrician Charlemagne. This Prince, who had already assumed an absolute authority, sent him back with an escort and commissioners who were to try him, and had orders to find him innocent. In short, Charlemagne, who was as absolute master of Italy as of Germany and France, the judge of the Pope, and arbiter of Europe, went to Rome at the end of the year 799. The Romans at that time began the new year at Christmas. Leo III. proclaimed him Emperor of the West during the time of mass on Christmas day 800. The people joined the ceremony with the loudest acclamations. Charles received the news with seeming surprize, but nevertheless, prepared to assert the rights annexed to his new dignity. Those rights were well founded, because the voice of a whole nation ever confers the best of rights.

Thus was the son of one of those Frank Captains, whom Constantine had condemned to be devoured by wild beasts, raised to the dignity of Constantine. On one hand a Frank, and on the other a Thracian, were
seen

seen sharing the Roman Empire. Such is the irregularity of fortune.

It has been asserted, and there are writers who still continue to assert, that Charles, even before he was made Emperor, had confirmed the donation of the Exarchate of Ravenna, and that he had increased it with the addition of Corsica, Sardinia, Liguria, Parma, Mantua, the Dutchies of Spoleto, Benevento, Sicily, and Venice, and that he deposited the act of this donation on the tomb, where it is pretended the ashes of St. Peter and St. Paul lie interred.

This donation might be ranked with that of Constantine. We cannot find that the Popes ever possessed any of those provinces, till the time of Innocent III. If they had been masters of the Exarchate, they would have been sovereigns of Ravenna and Rome: but in Charlemagne's will, which we meet with in Eginhardus, this monarch mentions Rome and Ravenna at the head of the metropolitan towns subject to his dominion, and to which he bequeaths some legacies. He could not possibly give away either Sicily, Corsica, or Sardinia, which were not in his possession; nor the Dutchy of Benevento, of which he had hardly the sovereign jurisdiction; much less Venice, which did not acknowledge him as Emperor. At that time the Duke of Venice, for form sake, recognized the Emperor of the East, from whom he received the title of Hippatos. Pope Adrian's letters make mention of the patrimonies of Spoleto and Benevento; but these patrimonies can mean no more than the estates or lands which the Popes possessed in those two Dutchies. Gregory VII. himself acknowledges in his letters that Charlemagne granted a pension of twelve hundred livres to the Holy See. It is by no means probable that he should grant such an aid to a person who was possessed of so many fine provinces. The Holy See did not acquire

Benevento

Benevento till a long time after, by a grant made to it as is supposed by Henry the Black, about the year 1047. This gift was confined to the town, but did not extend to the dutchy. There was no mention made in it of confirming the donation of Charlemagne.

The most probable account we can collect from the midst of so many uncertainties is, that in Charlemagne's time the Popes had obtained the full property of the Marquisate of Ancona, besides some towns, castles and villages dispersed in other countries. The grounds of my conjecture are as follows: When the Western Empire was revived in the family of the Othos in the tenth century, Otho III. particularly assigned the Marquisate of Ancona to the Holy See, confirming all the grants ever made to that church. It would seem therefore, as if Charlemagne had given this Marquisate to the Popes, who had been prevented from enjoying it, by the troubles which afterwards broke out in Italy. We shall see how they lost the possession of this small country under the Emperors of the house of Swabia. Sometimes we shall find them proprietors of vast tracts of land, and at other times despoiled of almost every possession, like other sovereigns. It will be sufficient for us to observe, that they enjoy at present the acknowledged sovereignty of a country that extends an hundred and fourscore Italian miles in length, from the gates of Mantua to the borders of Abruzzo, along the Adriatic; and more than an hundred miles in breadth, from Civita Vecchia to Ancona from sea to sea. They have at all times been obliged to negotiate, and oftentimes to fight, in order to secure the possession of these dominions.

At the time Charlemagne became Emperor of the West, the Empress Irene reigned in the East, a Princess who had made herself famous by her courage and her crimes, and who had caused her only

son to be put to death, after having first put out his eyes. She would have destroyed Charlemagne; but being too weak to make war against him, she resolved to marry him, and thus to reunite the two empires. While this marriage was in agitation, a revolution drove Irene from the throne, which she had purchased so dearly. Charles had therefore only the Empire of the West: his possessions in Spain were very inconsiderable; for the vain homage of a few Saracens ought not to be reckoned an inheritance: he possessed nothing on the coast of Africa; but all the rest was under his dominion.

If he had fixed on Rome as his capital, if his successors had established their principal residence in that city, and above all, if the Barbarians had not adhered to the custom of dividing dominions among their children, it is probable that the Roman Empire would have been revived. Every thing concurred afterwards to dismember that vast body, which the valour and fortune of Charlemagne had formed; but nothing contributed so much to it as his descendants.

He had no capital; only Aix-la-Chapelle was the place which pleased him the most: he there gave audiences with the greatest pomp to the Ambassadors of the Caliphs, and to those of Constantinople. In general however, he was either at war or traveling, as was the case with Charles the Fifth, who lived a long time after him. He divided his dominions even in his life time, as did all the kings of those days.

But at length, when of all the sons whom he had appointed to reign, there was none left but Louis, so well known afterwards by the name of the Handsome, to whom he had already given the kingdom of Aquitaine, he made him his associate in the empire at Aix-la-Chapelle; commanding him to take the imperial crown at the altar, to let the world see that
this

this crown was due only to the valour of the father, and the merit of the son; and as if he had foreseen that the time would come when the ministers of the altar would dispose of that diadem.

He did right to declare his son Emperor in his life-time; for this dignity, acquired by the fortune of Charlemagne, was not secured to his son by the right of inheritance: but in leaving the empire to Louis, and in giving Italy to Bernard, his son Pepin's heir, did not he himself rend in pieces that empire, which he was willing to preserve to his posterity? Was not this the natural means of arming his successors the one against the other? Was it to be presumed that the King of Italy would obey his uncle the Emperor, or that the Emperor would not desire to become master of Italy?

Charlemagne died in 814, with the reputation of having been an Emperor as happy as Augustus, and as warlike as Adrian; but not like the Trajans and Antoninuses, to whom no sovereign was ever worthy to be compared.

There was then in the East a Prince that equalled him in glory as well as in power: this was the celebrated Caliph Aaron-Al-Rachid, who greatly surpassed him in learning, humanity and justice.

I am almost tempted to place next to these two illustrious men, Pope Adrian, who in a less elevated rank, with little more than a private fortune, and with virtues less heroic, shewed a prudence to which his successors owed their elevation to grandeur.

The curiosity of mankind which penetrates into the private life of princes, has attempted to dive into the particulars of the life of Charlemagne, and even into his secret pleasures; and it has been asserted, that he carried his love of women so far as to enjoy it with his own daughters: the same has been said of Augustus; but of what importance to mankind is the divulging of these weaknesses, which have not the least influence on public affairs.

The church has ranked amongst the number of her saints this man who had shed so much blood, who deprived his nephews of their patrimony, and was suspected of incest.

I consider his reign in a light more worthy the attention of a citizen. The countries which at present compose France and Germany as far as the Rhine, enjoyed a state of tranquillity for near fifty years, and Italy during thirteen, from his accession to the empire. There happened no revolution in France, nor no calamity during this half century, which in this respect is not to be paralleled. So long a state of happiness was not however sufficient to restore politeness and the arts: the rust of barbarism was too great, and the following ages served only to increase it.

C H A P. XVII.

Of the Manners, Government, and Customs about the Time of Charlemagne.

LET us stop at this celebrated æra to consider the customs, the laws, the religion, and manners which then prevailed. The Franks had been always barbarians, and were so still after the death of Charlemagne.

It ought to be attentively noted, that Charlemagne did not seem in the least to consider himself as a Frank. The race of Clovis, and his companions the Franks, was always distinct from that of the Gauls. The German Pepin, and his son Charles, were distinct from the Franks. You will find a proof of this in the fourth article of the laws enacted by Charlemagne concerning his forests, in which he says, "If the
" Franks commit any offence in our possessions, let
" them

“ them be tried according to their own laws.” By this therefore it would seem as if the Franks were not held by Charlemagne to be of the nation. The family of this Emperor was always considered as of German origin at Rome. Pope Adrian IV. in his letter to the Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, and Treves, expresses himself in the following remarkable terms: “ The empire was transferred from the Greeks to the Germans; their King did not become Emperor till he had been crowned by the Pope “ All that the Emperor possesses he holds from us; “ and as Zachary gave the Greek empire to the “ Germans, so we can give that of the Germans to “ the Greeks.”

In France however, the name of Frank always prevailed. The name of *Franca* was often given to the family of Charlemagne at Rome, and even at Constantinople. The Greek court, even in the time of the Othos, described the Emperors of the West as usurpers, and barbarous Franks. It affected a contempt for these Franks, which was not real.

The reign of Charlemagne produced only a glimmering of politeness, which was probably the effect of his journey to Rome, or rather of his own genius.

His predecessors were famous for their depredations only: they destroyed towns, but built none. The Gauls were fortunate in being conquered by the Romans. Marseilles, Arles, Autun, Lyons, Triers, were flourishing cities, which peaceably enjoyed their municipal laws, subordinate to the sage institutions of the Romans. They were animated by an extensive trade. We find by a letter from a Proconsul to Theodosius, that in Autun there were five and twenty thousand heads of families. But as soon as the Burgundians, the Goths, the Franks, invaded Gaul, the great towns were depopulated. The circuses and amphitheatres built by the Romans even as far as the banks of the Rhine, were demolished or suffered to go to decay. If

If the wicked and unfortunate Queen Brunchaut kept up some of those Roman high roads, which no nation has ever imitated, it still occasions our surprize.

What could prevent these new-comers from erecting regular buildings after the Roman models? They had stone, marble, and better timber than we. The English and Spanish sheep were covered with as fine wool then as now; and yet good cloth was manufactured no where but in Italy. How happened it that the rest of Europe procured none of the commodities of Asia? Why were all those conveniences which tend to sweeten the bitterness of life, at that time wholly unknown, unless it was because the Barbarians, who passed the Rhine, made the other nations as barbarous as themselves. Of this we may judge by the Salic, the Ripuarian, and Burgundian laws, which Charlemagne himself confirmed, when he found he could not abolish them. The poverty and rapacity of these people had valued mens lives, mutilations, rapes, incest and poisoning, at a fixed price. Whoever had four hundred pence, that is four hundred crowns, to give away, might kill a Bishop with impunity. The life of a Priest was rated at two hundred pence; the same sum was to be paid for a rape, or for poisoning with herbs. A witch that had eaten of human flesh could escape for two hundred pence; and this shews that witches were not only to be found among the dregs of the people, as in these latter ages, but that those horrid extravagances were practised also by persons of fortune. Combats and experiments decided, as we shall see hereafter, the right of inheritance, and the validity of a testament. Barbarity and superstition constituted the whole of their jurisprudence.

We may judge of the manners of the people by those of their princes. Their history does not afford us a single instance of magnanimity. The Christian religion, which should humanize mankind, did not hinder King Clovis from causing the little kings, who were

were his neighbours and relations, to be assassinated. The two sons of Clodomir were murdered at Paris in 533, by their uncles Childebert and Clotharius, who are called Kings of France; and Clodoaldo, the brother of those slaughtered innocents, is invoked as a saint by the name of St. Cloud, because he was made a Monk.

A young Barbarian, of the name of Chram, made war upon his own father Clotharius, who was Regent of one part of Gaul; and in 559 the father caused the son to be burnt, together with all his friends, who had been made prisoners.

In 562, under a King of Soissons, named Chilperic, the subjects, unable any longer to submit to the tyranny of their master, who took from them their bread and their wine, deserted his pretended kingdom. Their money he could not take, because they had none. Sigebert and another Chilperic were assassinated. Queen Brunchaut, after quitting the Arian sect to embrace the Catholic religion, was accused of a thousand murders: and, in 616, Clotharius II. one as barbarous as herself, ordered her to be dragged after a horse's tail to his camp, till she expired under this new kind of punishment.

If this adventure is not true, it is at least certain that it was believed and considered as no extraordinary circumstance, and this opinion is sufficient to prove the barbarity of that age. The foundation of a few monasteries, and a confused account of misery and depredations, are the only monuments we have of those horrid times. Figure to yourselves a desert, in which wolves, and tigers, and foxes devour the scattered and timorous cattle, and you will have an idea of the state of Europe during so many ages.

We are not to believe that the emperors acknowledged those savage chiefs who governed in Burgundy, at Soissons, Paris, Metz, and Orleans, as kings. Never did they give them the title of *Basileus*: they did not even grant it to Dagobert II. who ruled over
all

all the western part of France as far as the Weser. Historians talk greatly of the magnificence of this Dagobert; in proof of which they relate a story of the goldsmith, St. Eloy, who appeared at court, it is said, with a girdle set with diamonds; that is, he sold diamonds, and therefore he carried them in his girdle. They tell us of the magnificent churches which he built. Where are they? The old church of St. Paul is a poor Gothic structure. All we know of Dagobert is, that he had three wives at once, that he summoned councils, and that he tyrannized over his country.

It was during his reign that a merchant of Sens, whose name was Samon, went to trade in Germany, from whence he proceeded as far as Slavonia. The barbarous inhabitants of that country were so amazed to see a man that had travelled so far to bring them things which they wanted, that they made him their king. This Samon, it is said, waged war with Dagobert: and if the King of the Franks had three wives, the new King of Slavonia had fifteen.

It was under this Dagobert that the authority of the Mayors of the Palace began to be established. After him succeeded a race of lazy kings, under the confused and despotic administration of the mayors. It was in the time of these mayors, in the beginning of the eighth century, that the Arabians, after conquering Spain, penetrated as far as Toulouse, made themselves masters of Guienne, ravaged the whole country as far as the Loire, and were very near wresting Gaul entirely from the Franks, as they had wrested it from the Romans. You may judge from hence, of the state in which the people, the church, and the laws must necessarily have been at that time.

Bishops had no share in the government till the reign of Pepin or Pipin, the father of Charles Martel, and grandfather to the other Pepin, who made himself king; the Bishops had no seat in the assemblies of the Frank nation. They were all either Gauls or
Italians,

Italians, people considered as vassals. It was in vain that Bishop Remi, who baptised Clovis, wrote to that Sicambrian* King, the famous letter in which are the following words: "Be careful not to take the upper hand of the Bishops; follow their advice; for so long as you act in concert with them, your administration will be easy." Neither Clovis however, nor any of his successors, made the clergy one of the orders of the state. The government was altogether military, and cannot be more aptly compared than to the states of Algiers and Tunis, which are governed by a chief and a militia. The Kings only consulted the Bishops occasionally when they wanted their assistance.

But when the Majordomos or Mayors of this militia insensibly usurped the supreme power, they were desirous of strengthening their authority by the credit of Prelates and Abbots, by calling them to the national assemblies.

It was in 692, according to the annals of Metz, that the Mayor Pepin, the first of that name, procured this prerogative for the clergy; an æra which has been negligently passed over by the generality of historians, but which is well deserving of notice, as it laid the first foundation of the temporal power of the Bishops and Abbots in France and Germany.

* The *Sicambri* were the ancient inhabitants of Westphalia. In an inaccurate edition of M. de Voltaire's works published formerly in London, the author's expression in this place of "L'Eveque Remi, qui batisa Clovis, avait écrit a ce Roi Sicambre," is thus rendered in English by the ignorant translator; "Bishop Remi, who baptised Clovis, wrote to *King Sicambus*." It would be endless to point out all the absurd blunders committed by those translators.—See the *Additions to Voltaire's General History*, page 54, published in 1763, under the names of Franklin, Smollet, and others. T.

C H A P. XVIII.

Continuation of the Manners of Charlemagne's Time, and before him.—Whether he was despotic and the Kingdom hereditary.

YOU are desirous of knowing whether Charlemagne, his predecessors and successors, were despotic, and whether their kingdom was secured to them by inheritance in those times? It is certain that Charlemagne was despotic, and consequently that his kingdom was hereditary, since we find him declaring his son emperor in a full assembly of the states. The right is not quite so certain as the fact; I will here tell you on what all the rights of those times were founded.

The inhabitants of the North and of Germany were originally a nation of hunters; and the Gauls, who were subdued by the Romans, either lived together in small towns, or cultivated their lands. A people who lived by hunting, and who were always armed, would therefore naturally get the better of a set of husbandmen and shepherds who were employed all the year in peaceful labour; and still more easily of the quiet inhabitants of the towns who lived in fancied security by their fire-sides. It was in this manner the Tartars made themselves masters of Asia, and the Goths came to the very gates of Rome. All the hords of Tartars, Goths, Huns, Vandals and Franks were governed by Chiefs. These rulers of a wandering people were elected by the plurality of voices, and it could not be otherwise, for what right could a robber have to lord it over his comrades? A free-booter, who was dextrous, fortunate, and daring, would naturally, after a time, acquire considerable authority over the plunderers who possessed these qualifications in a less degree than himself. They had all of them an equal share in the booty;
and

and this had always been an inviolable law among the earlier tribes of conquerors. If a proof were to be required of the antiquity of this law among those barbarians, we might easily find it in the story of that Frank who would not suffer Clovis to take a silver vase belonging to the church at Rheims from the general booty, and who cut the vessel in two with his battle-ax, without the Chief daring to oppose him.

In proportion as Clovis acquired power, he became despotic. This is the usual progress of human nature. It was the same with Charlemagne, who was the son of an usurper. The son of the lawful king was shaven and condemned to repeat his breviary in a convent in Normandy. Charlemagne was therefore obliged to act with the utmost precaution before a nation of warriors assembled in parliament. "Be it known to you—says he in one of his capitularies—that in consideration of our humility, and of our obedience to your counsels, which we render to you out of fear of God, we expect that on your parts ye will maintain the honour which God hath granted to us in like manner as your ancestors did with regard to ours."

Charlemagne's only ancestor however was his father, who had invaded the kingdom, and he himself had usurped his brother's portion of the government, and had robbed his nephews of their birth-right. He flattered the lords in parliament; but the parliament once dissolved, woe to him who dared to contradict his will!

As to the succession, it was natural that the Chief of a conquering people should engage them to elect his son for his successor. This custom of election became in time the most legal and inviolable of any, and still continues in force in the German empire. The right of election was considered as belonging so peculiarly to a conquering people, that when Pepin

usurped the kingdom of the Franks, after having deposed the lawful sovereign to whom he had been a domestic servant, Pope Stephen, who was in the usurpers interest forbade the French, on pain of excommunication, to elect any other for their King than a descendant of the race of Pepin. This excommunication was indeed as striking an example of superstition, as Pepin's enterprise was of boldness. But this very superstition is a proof of the right of election, and shews that the conquering nation elected from among the descendants of its chief, the person who was the most agreeable to it. We do not find the Pope saying, you shall elect only the first born of the house of Pepin; but, you shall never chuse a king from any other family.

Charlemagne says in one of his capitularies, "If
 " of one of the three Princes my children there
 " should be born a son, whom it shall please the na-
 " tion to call to the succession of his father, we will
 " that his uncles should consent to it." It is evident from this, as well as from many other proofs, that the Franks had at least in appearance a right of election. This custom was originally that of all nations, in all religions and in all countries. We see it established among the Jews, the other Asiatic nations and the Romans. The first successors of Mahomet were elected; the Sultans of Egypt, and the Miramolins held their authority by no other tenure; and it is only by length of time that a kingdom becomes entirely hereditary. Courage, address, and necessity, are the only laws,

C H A P. XIX.

*Continuation of the Customs in the Time of Charlemagne,
 and of the State of Commerce, Finances and the Sciences.*

CHARLES MARTEL, who usurped and supported the supreme power in a vast monarchy, and who

who subdued the warlike Arabs, whom he drove back as far as Gascony, was nevertheless only stiled *Subregulus*, or little Deputy King, by Pope Gregory II. who implored his protection against the Kings of Lombardy. He prepared to assist the Church of Rome, but in the mean time he robbed the Churches in France, distributed the monastic revenues among his captains, and kept his lawful sovereign Thierry in confinement. Pepin, the son of Charles Martel the *Subregulus*, made himself King and revived the Frank parliaments. He had always a body of well disciplined troops on foot, and it was to this establishment that Charlemagne was indebted for all his conquests. They were reviewed either on the first of March or the first of May; for it was commonly at those times the parliaments were held.

These troops were raised by the Dukes who governed the provinces, much in the same manner as the Beglerbegs amongst the Turks do at present. These Dukes had been instituted in Italy by Dioclesian. The Counts, who were instituted in the time of Theodosius, used to command under the Dukes, and assemble troops each in his canton. The farmers, the towns, and the villages, furnished a number of soldiers proportionable to their strength. Twelve farmers furnished a horseman completely armed, with a helmet and cuirass; the other soldiers did not wear them; but all had a buckler in the form of a long square, a battle-ax, a javelin and sword. They who used arrows were obliged to have at least twelve in their quiver. The province in which the militia was raised was obliged to furnish them with corn and other necessary provisions for six months; during the rest of the campaign they were supplied by the King.

In sieges they employed the battering ram, the *testudo**, and most of the Roman machines. The

* The *testudo* was a fence made of boards and covered with raw hides, under which the besiegers got up close to the walls

nobility, who were called Barons, or *Rich Men* (*Richeomes*), composed, with their followers, the little cavalry that was at that time seen in armies. The Mussulmen of Africa and Spain had a greater number of horsemen.

Charlemagne had naval forces, that is, large boats at the entrance of all the great rivers in his empire; before his time, they were unknown amongst the barbarians, and after him they were a long time without them. By this means, and by his warlike policy, he put a stop to the inundations of the northern nations, and kept them within their frozen climates; but under his weak descendants they spread all over Europe.

General affairs were regulated in assemblies which represented the nation. In his reign parliaments had no other will than that of a master, who knew how to command and persuade.

He made commerce flourish, because he was master of the seas; thus the merchants on the coast of Tuscany, and those of Marseilles, traded at Constantinople with the Christians, and at the port of Alexandria with the Mussulmen, by whom they were received, and from whom they drew the riches of Asia.

Venice and Genoa, which have since been rendered so powerful by their commerce, had not as yet drawn to themselves the riches of other nations; but Venice was beginning to increase in wealth and grandeur. Rome, Ravenna, Lyons, Arles and Tours, had many manufactures of woollen stuffs: they manufactured iron after the manner of Asia: glass was also made; but silk was not wove in any town in the Western Empire.

walls of a town. The balista was an instrument for throwing stones and darts; and the *aries* or battering ram, was an immense engine with horns of iron like a ram's head, with which the Romans used to beat down the walls of the towns they besieged. T.

The

The Venetians were the first who imported wrought silks from Constantinople; but it was not till almost four hundred years after Charlemagne's time that the Norman Princes established a manufacture of silk at Palermo. Linen was very uncommon; St. Boniface in a letter to a German Bishop, desires him to send him cloth with a large nap, to make use of in washing his feet. Probably this want of linen was the cause of all the diseases in the skin, known by the name of leprosy, and which were at that time so general; for the hospitals for lepers (*leproseries*) were already very numerous.

The value of money was nearly the same as it was in the Roman Empire after the reign of Constantine. The sou of gold was the *solidus Romanus**, which was equal to forty *deniers* of silver. These deniers, which were not always of the same size, weighed upon an average thirty grains.

The golden sou is at present, in 1740, worth about fifteen livres, and the silver denier thirty sous of the current money of France.

We ought always when we read history to remember, that besides this real specie in gold and silver, people in calculation made use of money of another denomination; expressing themselves frequently in ideal money, which as with us at present was only a manner of reckoning.

The Asiatics and Greeks counted by minæ and talents, and the Romans by sesterces†, without there

* A gold coin near the value of our *old noble*. The Roman *denarius* or denier, was of the value of eight-pence three farthings in our present money. T.

† The sesterce was in value the fourth of a denier or two asses and a half; and a thousand of these made the *sestertium* or great sesterce. The *talent* was a sum of money of different value in different places; thus the Attic talent was of 60 minæ, and the Egyptian talent of 120. The *mina* was equivalent to 3l. of our money. See Gronovius de pecun. vet. T.

being

being any such real money as a great sesterce or a talent.

The livre in the time of Charlemagne was supposed to weigh a pound of silver of twelve ounces, and this pound was divided as at present, into twenty parts. They had indeed silver sous like our crowns, each of which weighed the twentieth, the twenty-second, or the twenty-fourth part of a pound of twelve ounces; and this sou, like ours was divided into twelve deniers: but Charlemagne having ordered that the silver sou should be exactly the twentieth part of twelve ounces, they were accustomed to reckon in accounts twenty sous to a pound or livre.

During two centuries money continued on the footing on which Charlemagne had put it; but by degrees the kings in their wants sometimes lessened the weight; so that by a change, which is perhaps disgraceful to the governments in Europe, this sou, which was formerly very near equal to a crown piece, is no more than a light piece of copper with about an eleventh part in silver; and the livre, or pound, which was the representative of twelve ounces of silver, is at present in France no more than the representative of twenty of our copper sous. The denier, which was the two hundred and twenty-fourth part of a pound of silver, is no more than the third of that base money called a *liard*. Suppose then, that a city in France had been bound to pay yearly to another, the sum of an hundred and twenty sous, or solidi, it would be able to discharge the debt in these times by paying what we call a crown of six livres.

The pound of the English and Dutch has less variation. A pound sterling in England is worth about twenty two livres of France, and a pound in Holland is worth about twelve livres French; so that the Dutch have deviated less than the French from the original standard, and the English still less.

Whenever historians speak of money under the name of livres or pounds, we have nothing to do but to examine what a livre or pound was worth at the time and in the country spoken of, and to compare it with the value of ours. We ought to be equally attentive in reading the Greek and Roman history. It is for instance, very perplexing to the reader to be obliged to be perpetually correcting the accounts he meets with in the Ancient History of a celebrated Professor* of the University of Paris, in Fleury's Ecclesiastical History, and in so many other useful authors. When they would express talents, minæ, and sesterces in French money, they always use the valuation, which some learned men made before the death of the great Colbert: but the mark of eight ounces, which under this minister was worth twenty-six livres, and ten sous, has for a long time been worth forty-nine livres, which makes a difference of nearly half. This difference, which has been sometimes more considerable, may be increased or diminished. We must beware of these mistakes; otherwise we shall have a wrong idea of the strength of the ancient governments, of their troops, and of the whole of their civil œconomy.

It appears that the quantity of species in actual circulation in those days in France, in Italy, and towards the Rhine, was eight times less than it is at present. We can only form a judgment by the price of provisions; and I find that this was eight times less in the time of Charlemagne, that it is in our days. Four and twenty loaves of white bread were worth a silver denier, according to the capitularies.

* The author means M. Rollin, who published his Ancient History of the Egyptians, Carthaginians, &c. in 13 vols. 8vo. M. de Voltaire, in his Age of Louis XIV. speaks of it, "As the best compilation that has appeared in any language, because it is seldom that compilations are eloquent, and Rollin was remarkably so." T.

This denier was the fortieth part of a gold sou, which was worth about sixteen livres of our money: thus the pound of bread came to about a *liard*, and something over, which is in effect the eighth part of our usual price of bread.

Among the northern nations money was much more scarce: the price of an ox, for example, was in those countries rated at a golden sou. We shall have occasion to observe hereafter, how commerce and riches extended themselves and followed each other.

The sciences and the polite arts could have but a very feeble beginning, in those vast countries, which were as yet in an uncivilized state. Eginhardus, who was secretary to Charlemagne, informs us, that this conqueror did not know how to sign his name. And yet by mere strength of genius, he was convinced of the utility of polite learning. He procured teachers of grammar and rhetoric from Rome. From that ruined capital the rude nations of the West drew all their improvements. The celebrated Englishman Alcuinus, and Peter of Pisa, who taught Charlemagne a little grammar, had both studied at Rome.

There were choristers in the churches of France; and it is observable that they were called *Gallic choristers*. The conquering race of Franks had never cultivated any of the arts. The Gauls pretended, as they do now, to dispute the palm of music with the Romans. The Gregorian music, which has been attributed to St. Gregory, who was surnamed *the Great*, was not without merit, and had a certain dignity in the midst of its simplicity. The Gallic choristers, not being used to the old alphabetic notes, had spoiled this music, which they pretended to embellish. Charlemagne in one of his expeditions into Italy, obliged them to conform to the music of their masters. Pope Adrian gave them books with the notes pricked down; and two Italian musicians were appointed

appointed to teach the alphabetic notes, one at Metz and the other at Soissons. They were likewise obliged to procure their organs from Rome.

There were no clocks in any of the cities of his empire; nor were they introduced till towards the thirteenth century. Thence comes the ancient custom, which is still kept up in Germany, Flanders, and England, of hiring persons to cry the hour of the night. The clock, which was sent as a present to Charlemagne by the Caliph Aaron-Al-Rachid, was considered as a prodigy. In regard to the sciences, to philosophy, physics, astronomy, and the principles of medicine, how could they be known in that age of darkness, when they have but just begun to dawn even with us?

They computed time by nights, and hence it is that the English still make use of the word *fortnight*, to signify two weeks. The language called *Romance*, began to be formed of the mixture of the Latin with the Teutonic. The French, the Spanish, and the Italian languages were founded on this. It lasted till about the time of Frederick II. and is still spoken in some villages of the Grisons, and towards Switzerland.

The fashions have been continually changing in the West, ever since the decline of the Roman empire: at that time they dressed in short clothes, except on days of ceremony, when over their coat they wore a mantle frequently lined with furs; these they imported, as we do now, from the North, and especially from Russia. The Roman manner of covering the leg and foot was still preserved. We find it remarked that Charlemagne used to cover his legs with fillets twisted in the form of buskins, after the manner of the Scotch Highlanders, the only people who have preserved the military dress of the Romans.

C H A P. XX.

Of Religion in the Time of Charlemagne.

IF we now direct our inquiries to the advantages derived from religion, to the misfortunes which mankind drew upon themselves by rendering it subservient to their passions, to the sacred customs or ceremonies, and to the abuse of those customs; we shall find that the quarrel about image worship is what chiefly deserves our attention.

The Empress Irene, the tutored of her unhappy son Constantine Porphyrogenitus, in order to smooth the way to the government of the empire, ingratiated herself with the monks and common people, who were still pleased with the worship of images, proscribed by so many emperors since the time of Leo Isaurus; and she herself was attached to them, because her husband held them in abhorrence. Irene had been persuaded to believe, that in order to govern her husband, she need only put under his pillow the images of certain female saints: the greatest politicians are not always free from credulity. The Emperor her husband punished the authors of this superstition. Irene, after the death of her husband, gave a free course to her taste and ambition. This induced her, in 786, to assemble the second council of Nice, and the seventh œcumenical council, which was held at first at Constantinople. She began with causing her Secretary of State, who was a layman, named Tarasus, to be elected Patriarch. There had indeed been formerly some examples of laymen being chosen into a bishopric, without their passing through the other degrees; but at that time this custom no longer subsisted.

This Patriarch opened the council. The conduct of Pope Adrian was very remarkable. He did not anathematize the Secretary of State, who had been made Patriarch, but only modestly protested in his letter

letter to Irene against the title of Universal Patriarch, and insisted on her restoring to him his inheritance in Sicily. He demanded with authority that trifling patrimony, while he, as well as his predecessors, enjoyed the important demesnes of all the fine countries which he affirmed to have been given by Pepin and Charlemagne. In the mean time the œcumenical council of Nice, in which the Legates of the Pope presided, as well as the Patriarch, re-established the worship of images.

It is allowed by all judicious critics, that the Fathers of this council, who were three hundred and fifty in number, quoted the authority of many pieces that are evidently false; and of many miracles, the relation of which would have appeared scandalous in any other age; and of many apocryphal books. Yet these false pieces did no injury to the true ones, by which they regulated their decisions.

But how great was the embarrassment of the Pope when it became necessary to get the decisions of this council acknowledged by Charlemagne and the churches of France? That Emperor had publicly declared his aversion to images, and had just before caused some books to be written, called *Carolins*, in which this worship was anathematized. These books are written in a Latin tolerably pure. They prove that Charlemagne had succeeded in restoring literature; but at the same time they make it appear that there never was a theological dispute without invectives. The very title of these *Carolins* is abusive. “In the name of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” begins the second book of the most illustrious and “most excellent Prince Charles, &c. against the impertinent and arrogant Synod held in Greece for the adoration of images.” This book was attributed by its title to King Charles, in the same manner as we see public edicts issued under the name of the reigning prince, though he may have no hand in composing

composing them. It is certain that all the subjects of Charlemagne looked upon the Greeks as idolaters.

In 794, Charlemagne assembled a council at Francfort, in which he presided according to the custom of other Emperors; a council composed of three hundred Bishops and Abbots, as well Italians as French, who rejected by unanimous consent the service and adoration of images. This equivocal word *adoration* was the source of all these differences; for if men would define the terms they make use of, there would be fewer disputes. More than one kingdom has been overthrown by the misinterpretation of a word.

While Pope Adrian was sending the acts of the second council of Nice to France, he received the Caroline books, which were written in opposition to this council, and found himself solicited in the name of Charles to declare the Emperor of Constantinople and his mother heretics. It is sufficiently plain by this conduct, that Charlemagne was desirous of obtaining a new right from the pretended heresy of the Emperor, that he might take Rome from him under the colour of justice.

The Pope, divided between the Council of Nice, which he had adopted, and Charlemagne, whom he was desirous of pleasing, took, in my opinion, a politic medium, that ought to serve for an example in all those unhappy disputes which have constantly divided the Christian world. He explained the Caroline books in such a manner as was favourable to the council of Nice, and by that means refuted the King without displeasing him: at the same time he gave liberty to refuse the worship of images, which was very reasonable with respect to the Germans, who had been just converted from idolatry; and to the ignorant Franks, who had few sculptors and painters: but he exhorted them likewise not to demolish these images. Thus he satisfied every body, and left it

to

to
de
kin
int
in
"
"
"
"
"
a d
alor
kin
Gh
from
A
the
Fath
they
the
thro
The
were
neve
T
min
the
was
were
St. C
" pe
" ca
" th
" So
" th
" G
thori
and t
He w

to time to confirm or abolish a worship that was still doubtful. His great aim was to keep fair with mankind, and to make religion subservient to his own interests. This induced him to write to Charlemagne in the following terms: "After what the council of Nice has decided, I cannot declare Irene and her son heretics; but I shall declare them to be such, if they do not restore to me my inheritance in Sicily."

This Pope acted with the same interested policy in a dispute of a still more delicate nature, and which alone would in other times have been sufficient to kindle civil wars. It was disputed whether the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son, or from the Father alone.

An addition had long been made in the East to the first Council of Nice, that he proceeded from the *Father*; after this, in Spain, France, and Germany, they added, that he proceeded from the *Father* and the *Son*, and this was the prevailing opinion almost throughout the whole of Charlemagne's empire. These words in the creed, *qui ex Patre Filioque procedit*, were sacred with the French, but the same words had never been adopted at Rome.

The Pope was solicited by Charlemagne to determine this difference. This subject, which time and the erudition of the church afterwards cleared up, was then in a state of obscurity. Several passages were quoted from the Fathers, and particularly from St. Gregory of Nice, where it is said, that "One person is the *cause*, and the other comes from the *cause*; one proceeds immediately from the first, and the other proceeds from him also by means of the Son; by which means the Son reserves to himself the property of unity, without excluding the Holy Ghost from a relation to the Father." These authorities at that time did not appear sufficiently clear, and therefore Pope Adrian did not come to a decision. He was sensible that one may be a Christian without
being

being able to penetrate these profound mysteries; and in his answer he observed, that he did not condemn the King's opinion, but yet he made no alteration in the Roman creed. Thus he appeased the dispute, without coming to a decision, by leaving every one entirely at liberty. In a word, he treated spiritual affairs like a prince, while too many princes have treated them like bishops.

From that time the profound policy of the Popes gradually established their power. They forged a collection of acts, known at present by the name of the *false decretals*; and which are said to have been digested by a Spaniard named *Isidorus mercator*, or *piscator*, or *peccator*. The German Bishops, whose sincerity was imposed upon, spread them abroad, and gave them their weight. There are now said to be indubitable proofs of their having been composed by one Algeram, Abbot of Senones and Bishop of Metz. They are among the manuscripts of the Vatican Library. But what signifies it who is their author? In these false decretals ancient canons are supposed, which ordain, that a single provincial council should not be held without the permission of the Pope; and that all ecclesiastical causes shall be under his jurisdiction. The words of the immediate successors of the Apostles are there quoted, and they are supposed to have left writings behind them. It is true, that the whole being written in the wretched style of the eighth century, and filled with errors both in history and geography, the artifice was extremely gross; but they had none but ignorant men to deceive.

Similar forgeries had been committed in the earliest days of Christianity; such, for example, were the Sibylline Verses, the Books of Hermes, the Apostolical Constitutions, and a thousand other writings which have been reprobated by sound criticism.

These false decretals imposed upon mankind during eight centuries; and at length, when the error was discovered, the customs they had established still con-

tinued to subsist in a part of the church: their antiquity supplied the place of truth.

In those times the Bishops of the West were temporal lords, and possessed many lands in fee, but none of them were independent sovereigns. The Kings of France nominated to bishoprics: in this instance they were more bold, and acted more agreeably to the rules of policy, than the Grecian Emperors and the Kings of the Lombards, who contented themselves with interposing their authority in elections.

The first Christian churches were governed as a republic in the manner of synagogues; those who presided over these assemblies insensibly took the title of Bishop, from a Greek word, which the Greeks applied to those who were appointed governors of their colonies; and the elders of these assemblies called themselves Priests, which in Greek signifies old men.

Charlemagne in his old age granted the bishops a privilege, of which his own son was made the victim. They persuaded this prince, that in the Theodosian code, there was a law which expressly mentioned, that if two laymen had a suit depending, and one of them chose a bishop for his judge, the other was obliged to submit to his decision without the power of appeal. This law, which has never been executed, is considered by all the critics as fictitious. It is the last in the code, without a date, and without the names of the consuls. This article insensibly excited a civil war between the courts of justice and the ministers of the sanctuary; but as in those times every body in the West, except the clergy, were involved in profound ignorance, it is astonishing that they did not give still greater power to those, who having obtained a little instruction, seemed the only persons qualified to decide the differences among mankind.

But if the bishops disputed for authority with the laity, the monks began to dispute it with the bishops,

Z

who

who however were their masters, by the canons; but these monks were already too rich to shew their obedience. The celebrated form adopted by Marculfus had already been frequently used; "I, for the repose
 " of my soul, and to prevent my being placed after
 " death amongst the goats, give to such a monastery,
 " &c. &c." It was generally believed in the first age of the church that the world was near its end. This belief was founded on a passage in St. Luke, where these words are put into the mouth of Jesus Christ: "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the
 " moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth
 " distress of nations with perplexity, the sea and the
 " waves roaring, mens hearts failing them for fear,
 " and for looking after those things which are coming
 " on the earth: for the powers of heaven shall be
 " shaken, and then they shall see the Son of
 " Man coming in a cloud, with power and great
 " glory. So likewise ye, when ye see these things
 " come to pass, know ye that the kingdom of God
 " is nigh at hand. Verily, I say unto you, this
 " generation shall not pass away till all be fulfilled."

Several pious persons who took this prediction according to the letter, which, say the commentators, regards Jerusalem only, thought that the world was going to be destroyed, and expected the approach of the last day, when Jesus Christ was to come in the clouds. This opinion was likewise strengthened by the following passage in St. Paul's First Epistle to the Thessalonians: "We which are alive, and remain, shall be
 " caught up together in the clouds to meet the Lord
 " in the air." Hence arose all those suppositions of numberless prodigies seen in the heavens. Each generation thought itself that which was to see the end of the world; and this opinion growing stronger in after-ages, people gave their estates to monks, as if this would be a means to preserve them from the general conflagration. Several deeds of
 donation

donation begin with these words, *Adventante mundi vespero.*

The Benedictine Abbots were, long before Charlemagne, so powerful as to revolt; and an Abbot of Fontenelle had the presumption to put himself at the head of a party against Charles Martel, and to raise troops: but the hero caused the Monk to be beheaded; and this execution did not a little contribute to the revelations which have since been made to so many monks, in regard to the damnation of Charles Martel.

Before that time, we find an Abbot of St. Remy at Rheims, and the Bishop of that city, carrying on a civil war in the sixth century against Childebert; a crime that could be committed by none but men in power.

The Bishops and Abbots had many slaves. Alcuinus the Abbot was reproached with having even twenty thousand. This number is not incredible, since Alcuinus had three abbeys, the lands of which might be inhabited by at least twenty thousand men. These slaves, known by the name of *Villains*, could neither marry nor change their abode without the Abbot's permission, and were obliged to march fifty leagues with their carts whenever he pleased to order them; they worked for him three days in a week, and he partook of all the fruits of the earth.

It was impossible indeed to reproach those Benedictines with violating, by their riches, their vow of poverty, for they make no such vow. The only engagement they make, when they enter into the order, is to obey their Abbot. They frequently had donations of waste lands, which they cleared with their own hands, and afterwards employed their bondmen to till them. They built villages, and even little towns around their monasteries. They applied themselves to study, and were the only persons who preserved books by transcribing them; in short, in those barbarous days, when the generality of the people

were so miserable, it was a great consolation to find a secure retreat from tyranny in a monastic life.

In France and Germany more than one bishop led their *villains* to battle. Charlemagne, in a letter to Frastade, one of his wives, tells her of a bishop who fought valiantly by his side in a battle against the Avari, a people descended from the Scythians, who dwelt near the country now called Austria. We read in his time of fourteen monasteries which were obliged to furnish soldiers; and if an Abbot had never so little of the warrior, nothing hindered him from commanding them himself. It is true, that in 803, a parliament complained to Charlemagne of the too great number of priests that had been killed in war. The ministers of the altar were therefore forbid to go to battle, but this injunction was ineffectual. No person was allowed to stile himself Clerk, without being really so, or to wear the tonsure without belonging to a bishop. Such clerks were called *Acephali*, and punished as vagabonds. At that time they had no idea of an order which is so common in these days, and which is neither secular nor ecclesiastic; for the title of Abbot, which signifies father, only belonged to the chiefs of monasteries.

The abbots had then the pastoral staff which was borne by bishops, and which formerly was the mark of the pontifical dignity in Pagan Rome. Such was the power of those abbots over the monks, that they sometimes condemned them to the most cruel punishments. They adopted a barbarous custom from the Greek Emperors of burning out the eyes; and a council was under the necessity of putting a stop to this horrid practice, which they began to consider as a right.

C H A P. XXI.

Of the Religious Ceremonies in the Time of Charlemagne.

THE mass in those times was very unlike what it is at present, and differed still more from what it was in the primitive ages. It was at first a supper, a kind of feast, but afterwards the dignity of the ceremony increasing with the number of the faithful, this nocturnal meeting was changed into an assembly of the morning, till by degrees it became nearly similar to the present high mass. Till the fifth century there was only one common mass celebrated in each church. The name *synaxis* which it has among the Greeks, and which signifies an *assembly*; the forms also of addressing this assembly which still subsist, all plainly shew that it was long before private masses were introduced. This sacrifice, this meeting, this common prayer, was called *missa* in the Latin church, because, according to some, the penitents who did not receive the communion, were dismissed, *mittebantur*; or according to others, because the sacrament was sent, *missa erat*, to those who could not come to church.

When the number of priests was increased, they were obliged to say private masses. The great lords had their chaplains; and Agobard, Bishop of Lyons complains of this abuse in the ninth century. It is confirmed by Dionysius Exiguus, in his collection of canons, and by several others, that all the faithful received the holy communion at the public mass. In his time the people brought the bread and wine, for the priest to consecrate; and each person took the bread in his hand. This bread was fermented like common bread, and was given even to children; there were but very few churches in which unleavened bread was used. The communion in both kinds

kind

kinds was universally received in the time of Charlemagne; this custom was always kept up by the Greeks, and continued among the Latins till the twelfth century. We find that it was practised sometimes even in the thirteenth. The author of the relation of the victory obtained by Charles of Anjou over Manfred in 1264, takes notice that his Knights received the sacrament in bread and wine before the battle. The custom of dipping the bread into the wine was established before the time of Charlemagne; that of sucking the wine through a metal pipe or syphon, was not introduced till about two hundred years after, and was soon abolished. All these rites and practices varied according to the circumstances of the times, and the prudence of the pastors.

The Latin church was the only one that prayed in a strange language, which was unknown to the common people. This had been owing to the inundations of barbarians, who introduced their respective idioms into different parts of Europe. The Latins were likewise the only people that baptized by aspersion only; an indulgence very natural for children born in cold northern climates; and a proper decency in the warm climate of Italy. The ceremonies observed in conferring baptism on adult persons and on infants were not the same. This difference was pointed out by nature.

We are told that auricular confession began to be introduced so early as the sixth century: the bishops, by the article of the council of Attigny in 763, required that the canons should confess to them twice a year, and it was expressly commanded. The abbots obliged their monks to submit to this yoke; and the laity put it on by degrees. Public confession was never in use in the West; for when the Barbarians embraced Christianity, the abuse and scandal with which it was attended, occasioned its being abolished in the East, under the Patriarch Nectarius,

at

at
fre
espo
cen
I ca
the
chu
diat
twel
the
was
Loin
com
thofe
natio
chur
chur
attai
and
Gree
thofe
whic
coun
perfo
matte
In
in the
regula
Abbo
It v
to a w
lafted
felled

* Fl
of the
council
Prince,
at Paris

at the end of the fourth century: but public sinners frequently did public penance in the western churches, especially in Spain, where the invasion of the Saracens redoubled the fervour of the humbled Christians. I can find no traces of the form of confession, or of the confession boxes which we see fixed in our churches, or of the necessity of confessing immediately before receiving the sacrament, until the twelfth century. You will find that even so late as the eighth and ninth centuries, auricular confession was received in none of the countries beyond the Loire, or in Languedoc or the Alps. Alcuinus* complains of them in his letters. The inhabitants of those countries appear to have always had an inclination to abide by the customs of the primitive church, and to reject the tenets and forms which the church judged it convenient to adopt, when it had attained to a more flourishing state. In the eighth and ninth centuries they had three lents, as in the Greek church, and they generally confessed at each of those periods. The commandments of the church, which were not ascertained till after the fourth council of Lateran in 1215, laid an injunction of performing once a year, what before seemed to be a matter of choice.

In the reign of Charlemagne they had confessors in the armies. Charles had one for himself, who had a regular appointment: his name was Valdo, and he was Abbot of Augi in the neighbourhood of Constance.

It was permitted to confess to a layman, or even to a woman in case of necessity; and this permission lasted a long time. Hence Joinville tells us, he confessed a Knight in Africa, and gave him absolution

* Flaccus Alcuinus, or Alwin, was a learned English writer of the 8th century. He accompanied Charlemagne to the council of Frankfort in 794, and was highly esteemed by that Prince, he died at Tours in 804. His works were published at Paris in one volume folio in 1617. T.

purfuant

purfuant to the power he poffeffed of fo doing. *It is not altogether a facrament*, fays St. Thomas, *but a kind of facrament*.

Confeflion may be confidered as the greateft check to fecret crimes. The fages of antiquity had in fome meafure embraced this falutary practice. It was ufual among the Egyptians and the Greeks, to make a confeflion of fins at their expiations, and almoft at every celebration of their myfteries. Marcus Aurelius, affifting at the myfteries of Ceres Eleufina, confefled to the *Hierophantes**.

This practice, which was originally eftablifhed from pious motives among Chriftians, afterwards unfortunately occafioned the moft dreadful abufes. The weaknefs of the fex fometimes rendered women more dependant on their confeflors than on their husbands. Almoft all thofe who were confeflors to Queens, availed themfelves of the fecret and fecret influence they had over their penitents, to make their way into the affairs of the ftate. When a Monk had once gained an afcendency over the confcience of his fovereign, all his brethren took the advantage of it, and many of them made ufe of the credit of the confeflor to revenge themfelves on their enemies. In fhort, during the quarrels between the Emperors and the Popes, and the factions of particular cities, the priefts went fo far as to refufe abfolution to thofe who were not of their party. An inftance of this occurred in France in the reign of Henry IV. when almoft all the confeflors refufed to abfolve thofe fubjects who acknowledged him for their King. Such is the lamentable ftate of human nature, that the moft fovereign remedies are frequently converted into poifon.

The Chriftian religion had as yet extended no farther in the North, than the conquelts of Charle-

* The Hierophantes were the interpreters of the fecret myfteries. T.

magn
called
fhip
of Id
divine
be th
painte
and b
would
of the
their
are fou
long b
Druids
they w
the pr
would
Pola
Musco
tary, f
but all
happy
knowle
The
religion
before
tor of a
but it d
of the
vent it
ftructed
Iflander

* Pela
faid to ha
mare, he
word for
powers m
fuch thing
Italy and
lagian her
Vol. I.

magne. Scandinavia and Denmark, which were then called the country of the Normans, had a kind of worship which we ridiculously stile Idolatry. The religion of Idolaters must certainly consist in attributing a divine power to images, or figures; but this could not be the religion of the Scandinavians, who had neither painter nor sculptor amongst them. They adored *Odin*, and believed that the happiness of man in a future state would consist in drinking beer in the hall of *Odin*, out of the skulls of his enemies. We have still some of their ancient songs, which have been translated and are found to express this notion. The northern nations long before this had believed in a future life. The Druids had taught the ancient Gauls to imagine, that they would rise again after death in order to fight; and the priests of Scandinavia persuaded men, that they would drink beer in a future state.

Poland was equally barbarous and ignorant. The Muscovites, more savage than the rest of Grand Tartary, scarcely knew enough to be reckoned Pagans: but all these nations enjoyed their ignorance in peace; happy in being unknown to Charlemagne, who sold the knowledge of Christianity at so high a price!

The English were beginning to receive the Christian religion. It had been carried into that Island a little before this by Constantius Chlorus, the secret protector of a religion which was at that time persecuted: but it did not prevail much there; the ancient worship of the country continued during a long time to prevent its progress. Some missionaries from Gaul instructed in a rude manner a small number of those Islanders. The famous Pelagius*, too zealous a de-

* Pelagius was born in the fourth century. His real name is said to have been Morgan, which signifying the sea, in Latin *mare*, he is thence called Pelagius from *Pelagus* another Latin word for the sea. He contended that man by his own natural powers may attain to a state of perfection, and that there is no such thing as original sin. He was persecuted for his doctrines in Italy and other countries, but had many followers: and the Pelagian heresy, as it is called, spread itself both in the East and

fender of human nature, was born in England; but he was not educated there, and ought to be reckoned amongst the Romans.

Ireland, then called Scotland, and Scotland known at that time by the name of *Albania*, or the country of the *Picts*, had also received some seeds of Christianity, that were constantly stifled by the superior influence of the ancient worship. Columbanus the Monk, was born in Ireland in the sixth century; but it appears by his retreat into France, and the monasteries he founded in Burgundy, that those had little to do, and much to apprehend, who sought in England and Ireland for such rich and peaceful establishments as were found in other countries under the shelter of religion.

After an almost total extinction of Christianity in England, Scotland, and Ireland, it was revived by conjugal tenderness. Ethelbert, one of the barbarous Anglo-Saxon kings in the Heptarchy, who had his little kingdom in the county of Kent, in which is Canterbury, was desirous of forming an alliance with a king of France, and married the daughter of Childebert, king of Paris. This Christian Princess, who crossed the sea with a Bishop of Soissons, prevailed on her husband to consent to be baptized, as Clotilda had prevailed on Clovis. Pope Gregory the Great sent Augustine, or as the English stile him, Austin, with other Roman monks, into England in 598; but they made but few converts; for it was at least necessary that they should understand the language of the country, before they could make any change in its religion; however, being favoured by the queen, they founded a monastery.

It was in fact the queen who converted the little kingdom of Canterbury. Her barbarous subjects, who had no opinions of their own, easily followed the example of their sovereigns. This Augustine found no difficulty in obtaining the rank of primate from Gregory the Great; he was even desirous of obtaining the same rank in Gaul; but Gregory wrote him word,

West, and took so deep root, that it subsists to this day in different sects, who all go by the general name of Pelagians. T.

that

that
fides
arch
Engl
bisho
The
of A
tibus
with
eight
had g
ber o
of th
seven
Their
queen
that t
themse
of som
vent in
health

Continu
the
Usage

C
b
their di
laws, w
nor so n
ple; for
cause: l
tained n
empire.
the rest

that he could not give him any other jurisdiction besides that over England. He was therefore the first archbishop of Canterbury, and the first primate of England. To one of his monks he gave the title of bishop of London, and to another that of Rochester. These bishops may very properly be compared to those of Antioch and Babylon, who are called bishops *in partibus infidelium*: but the English Hierarchy encreased with time. Monasteries especially were very rich in the eighth and ninth centuries; and all the great lords who had given them lands, were placed amongst the number of saints; this is the reason why in the catalogue of the saints of those times we find seven kings, seven queens, eight princes, and sixteen princesses. Their chronicles inform us, that ten kings and eleven queens ended their days in cloysters: it is probable, that these ten kings and eleven queens only ordered themselves to be cloathed at their death in the habits of some religious order, and perhaps, carried to a convent in their last sickness; but not that they really in health gave up all public affairs to lead a monastic life.

C H A P. XXII.

Continuation of the Customs in the Time of Charlemagne.—Of the Administration of Justice and the Laws.—Singular Usages.

COUNTS, who were nominated by the king, distributed justice in a summary way. They had each their districts, and were required to be versed in the laws, which were neither so difficult to be understood, nor so numerous as ours. The proceedings were simple; for in France and Germany each pleaded his own cause: but Rome alone, and its territories, still retained many of the laws and formalities of the Roman empire. The laws of the Lombards were established in the rest of upper Italy.

A a 2

Each

Each count had under him a lieutenant, called a *viguier*, seven assistants called *scabini*, and a clerk called *notarius*. The counts published in their several jurisdictions the order of the marches in time of war; it was likewise their business to enrol the soldiery and conduct them to the rendezvous; and then they left their lieutenants to perform the office of judge.

The kings sent commissaries with letters patent, *missi Dominici*, who examined the conduct of the counts; but neither these commissaries nor the counts hardly ever condemned a person to suffer death, or corporal punishment: for if we except Saxony, where Charlemagne made sanguinary laws, almost all offences in the rest of his empire were atoned for by money. Rebellion alone was punished with death; and in this case, the power of giving judgment was reserved by the kings to themselves. The Salic or Ripuarian law, and that of the Lombards, had, as we have already observed, set a price in money on most other transgressions.

Their civil law, which appeared humane, was perhaps in reality more cruel than ours; for it left the liberty of doing ill to all who were able to pay for it. The mildest law is that which, by putting the most terrible constraint on iniquity, prevents the multiplication of crimes; but the use of the torture, that dangerous practice, which serves but too often to save the guilty and destroy the innocent, was as yet unknown.

The Salic laws were vigorously restored by Charlemagne. Among these laws we find one that expressly shews in what contempt the Romans were held amongst the barbarous nations. The Frank, who had killed a Roman citizen, paid only one thousand and fifty deniers; while the Roman paid for the blood of a Frank two thousand five hundred deniers.

In criminal causes that could not be decided, they purged themselves by an oath; and the party accused was required not only to swear himself, but also to produce a certain number of witnesses to swear with him. When the two parties opposed oath to oath, they

they
in w
blun
T
this
rable
the
water
has
these
accu
cold
throw
to th
arose
Fleur
a cer
rather
many
their
not t
times
sons,
This
towns
where
been
judges
the lif
sacrific
The
plungi
tub of
he wa
the pre
of the

* A
fessor of
Colbert.

they were sometimes permitted to decide it by combat, in which they sometimes fought till their weapons were blunted, and sometimes to the utmost extremity.

These combats were called *the Judgments of God*; and this was also the name given to one of the most deplorable follies of this barbarous government; by which the accused were put to the ordeal of cold water, hot water, or red hot iron. The celebrated Stephen Baluze* has collected all the ancient ceremonies belonging to these ordeals. They began with the mass, when the accused received the eucharist: they then blessed the cold water, exorcised it; and at last the accused was thrown, bound with cords, into the water; if he sunk to the bottom he was reputed innocent, but if he arose to the top he was adjudged to be guilty. Mr. de Fleury, in his Ecclesiastical History, says, that this was a certain method of finding nobody criminal; but I rather believe that it was a certain method of destroying many innocent persons. There are many who have their breast so expanded and their lungs so light, as not to permit them to sink, when a rope, tied many times about them, forms, in conjunction with their persons, a body lighter than an equal quantity of water. This unhappy custom, though since prohibited in great towns, has subsisted till very lately in many provinces, where those suspected of using witchcraft, have often been condemned to it, even by the sentence of the judges; for nothing lasts so long as superstition: and the life of more than one unhappy person has been sacrificed to this.

The judgment of God by hot water was executed by plunging the naked arm of the accused person into a tub of boiling water, from the bottom of which he was to take a consecrated ring. The judge, in the presence of the priests and people, enclosed the arm of the patient in a bag, sealed it with his own seal, and

* A French writer, born at Tullies in 1631. He was professor of the canon law, at Paris, and librarian to the great Colbert. He died in 1718. T.

if there was no appearance of a scalding to be discovered on the arm three days after this, the innocence of the accused was acknowledged.

There is an anecdote of Queen Teuthberga, daughter-in-law to the Emperor Lotharius, grandson to Charlemagne, which is related by all the historians. This princess being accused of having committed incest with her brother, who was a monk and subdeacon, nominated a champion, who in her stead submitted to the trial of boiling water in the presence of a numerous court, and took out the ring without being scalded. It is certain that there are secrets to bear the action of fire for a few seconds without being hurt; I have seen some instances of it myself: these secrets must at that time have been more common, as there was a greater necessity for them. But there is no secret for rendering a man absolutely invulnerable. It is very probable that at those strange judgments, they made the person undergo a more or less severe trial, according as they were inclined to condemn or to acquit him.

The trial of boiling water was designed particularly for the conviction of adultery. These customs are of a more ancient date, and spread farther than people imagine. The women accused of this crime among the Jews, were obliged by the law of Moses to undergo the trial of the *waters of jealousy*. They drank in the presence of the priests a water which had been mixed with some consecrated ashes. This, which was a salutary potion to the innocent, caused the guilty to swell and burst upon the spot.

It is well known to the learned, that in the temple of the *Dii Palici** in Sicily, the accused used to write down his oath, which was thrown into a basin of water, and if it swam upon the surface, the person was ac-

* The Palici were supposed by the ancients to be the two sons of Jupiter by Thalia, or according to some, by Ætna, who fearing the resentment of Juno, prayed the Earth to open and receive them. The prayer was heard, and at the end of ten months the Earth again opened and restored them to light: hence their name of *Palicii*, from *πάλιν ἔσεσθαι*, *denuo nasci*. The Sicilians deified them,

quitted. The temple of Træzena was famous for similar trials. At the very extremity of the East, in Malabar and Japan, we meet with customs of the same kind, founded on the simplicity of the primitive ages, and on the superstition which is common to all nations.

The third trial was that of a bar of red hot iron, which the person was to carry in his hand while he walked nine steps. It was more difficult to deceive in this than in the other trials, and therefore I do not read of any one who submitted to it in those uncivilized ages.

You wish to know which of the two churches, the Greek or the Latin, first established these customs. We find instances of these trials at Constantinople as late as the thirteenth century; and Pachymerus tells us he was an eye-witness of them. It would seem likely therefore that the Greeks communicated these oriental superstitions to the Latins.

In regard to the civil laws, the following one seems to me to be the most remarkable: A man who had no children might adopt them. Husbands might repudiate their wives by due course of law, and after the divorce they were suffered to marry another woman. We meet with a particular account of these laws in Marculfus.

But what will, perhaps, appear more astonishing, though it is not less true, is, that in the second book of these formularies of Marculfus, we find that nothing was more readily permitted, nor more common than to derogate from that famous Salic law, by which the daughters were not allowed to inherit. In these cases, a person brought his daughter before the count or his commissary, and said, "My dear daughter, an ancient and impious custom deprives our daughters of any share in our paternal estates; but having considered

them, and swore by their name in all controversies. On the spot where they rose out of the earth two small lakes are said to have been formed, the waters of which were in great veneration for the conviction of perjurers. See *Macrob. Sat.* 5, 19. T.

" this

“ this impiety, I have found, that as you have all been
 “ equally given to me by God, I ought to love you
 “ all alike ; therefore, my dear daughter, I desire that
 “ you may inherit an equal share with your brothers of
 “ all my lands, &c.”

The Franks, who lived according to the Salic and Ripuarian laws, were entirely unacquainted with the distinction of nobles and plebeians; of nobles by title and arms, and of nobles *ab avo*, or persons living nobly. They had but two orders of citizens, freemen and *villains*, as is nearly the case now-a-days among the Mahometans and in China. In the capitularies* of Charlemagne, the word *nobilis* is used but once, in the fifth book, to signify the officers and the counts.

All the cities of Italy and France were governed according to their municipal laws. The duties which they paid to the sovereign consisted in *foderum*, *paratam*, *mantionaticum*, *forage*, *provisions*, and *moveable goods*. For a long time emperors and kings kept their court upon their demesnes, and when they travelled, on these duties payable in kind. There is still extant one of Charlemagne's capitularies, in which he is very minute on this subject. He orders an exact account of his flocks to be given in to him. We find that bees constituted one of the most valuable articles of a country stock. In short, the most trifling as well as most important events of those times lead us to the knowledge of laws, manners, and usages, of which there are hardly any vestiges remaining at present.

* Capitularies, or capitulars, is the name usually given to the laws and regulations which the kings of France made at the meetings of their parliament. Baluze published a collection of them in 1677. T.

C H A P. XXIII.

Louis the Weak, or the Debonnair, deposed by his Children and Prelates.

THE history of the great events of this world may be considered as a register of crimes. The ambition of the laity and the ecclesiastics has filled every age with horror.

Charlemagne was no sooner in his tomb, than his family and the empire were exposed to the ravages of a civil war.

The archbishops of Milan and Cremona lighted the first flames, under the pretence that Bernard, King of Italy, was the chief of the Carlovingian family, being son to Charlemagne's eldest son. We are never at a loss to discover the true reason in that mad propensity to raise commotions, and in that frenzy of ambition which avails itself even of the laws made to repress it. A bishop of Orleans entered into their intrigues; both the uncle and nephew raised forces, and were ready to come to an engagement at Chalons-sur-Saone; but the Emperor's party gained half the Italian army by money and promises. They then began to negotiate, that is, they aimed at deceiving each other. The king was so imprudent as to come to his uncle's camp; when Louis, who was called the *Debonnair*, because he was weak, and who was cruel merely from that weakness, caused his nephew's eyes to be put out, though he begged for mercy on his knees. The unhappy king died of the torment he suffered in his body and mind, three days after that cruel execution. He was interred at Milan, and on his tomb was engraved, *Here lies Bernard of pious memory*. The word *pious* or *saint* at that time seems to have been only an honourable title. Louis then caused his three brothers to be shaven and shut up in a monastery, lest their being of the blood of Charlemagne should entitle them to too much respect, and occasion wars in their favour. But this was not

all; the emperor ordered all Bernard's partisans to be arrested, whom that king had discovered, from the hope of obtaining mercy; and they suffered the same punishments as himself: the ecclesiastics, however, were excepted; they, who were the authors of the war, were spared, and deposition or exile was their only punishment. Louis aimed at keeping fair with the church; and the church soon made him sensible that he ought to have behaved with less cruelty and more firmness.

Louis, in 817, followed his father's bad example in giving kingdoms to his children, and having neither his father's strength of mind, nor the authority it brings with it, he exposed himself to the effects of ingratitude. With all his barbarity as an uncle, and severity as a brother, as a father he was certainly too indulgent.

After having raised his eldest son Lotharius to be his colleague in the empire, and giving Aquitain to the second named Pepin, and Bavaria to Louis his third son, there still remained an infant whom he had had by a second wife: this was Charles the Bald, who was afterwards emperor: he resolved after the division not to leave this child, the son of a wife whom he loved, without dominions.

One of the sources to which we may ascribe the misfortunes of Louis the Weak, and so many other greater disasters with which Europe has been afflicted, was that abuse which began to arise of granting power in the world to those who had renounced the world.

Vala, abbot of Corby, an illegitimate relation of Louis, was the person who began this memorable scene. He was a man whom zeal, or the spirit of faction, or both together, had rendered furious; one of those party leaders, who have been so often observed to do a great deal of mischief while they preach up virtue, and to throw every thing into confusion for the sake of order and discipline.

In a parliament held at Aix-la-Chapelle in the year 829; a parliament to which the abbots were admitted from their being lords of very large manors, this Vala publicly

pub
the
" o
the
wen
He
of b
shor
and
pron
A
Vala
to h
gave
which
If
autho
the r
which
child
from
ther,
marria
At
compl
Corby
a still
abbeys
prés,
fo. 7
joining
declari
rebels
Debon
council
His son
instanc
their fa
send him
abbots,

publicly reproached the emperor for all the disorders in the state: "It is you," said he, "that are guilty of them." He afterwards spoke to every member of the parliament, even in a more seditious manner. He went so far as to accuse the Empress Judith of adultery. He strove to hinder the gifts the emperor was desirous of bestowing on the son he had by this empress; in short, he dishonoured and disturbed the royal family, and consequently the empire, under the pretence of promoting the welfare of the state.

At length the emperor, being irritated, sent back Vala to his monastery, which he certainly ought never to have quitted; and resolving to satisfy his wife, he gave her son a small part of Germany towards the Rhine, which was Switzerland and Franche-Comté.

If the laws of Europe had been founded on paternal authority, and if every mind had been penetrated with the necessity of filial respect, as the first of all duties, which I have observed is the case in China, the three children of the emperor, who had received their crowns from him, would not have revolted against their father, for giving an inheritance to a child by a second marriage.

At first they contented themselves with venting their complaints; but it was not long before the Abbot of Corby joined with the Abbot of St. Denis, a person of a still more factious disposition, and who having the abbey of St. Medard, Soissons, and St. Germain-des-prés, was capable of raising forces, and soon after did so. The Bishops of Vienne, Lyons, and Amiens, joining these monks, excited the princes to a civil war, declaring that all who were not of their party were rebels to God and the church. In vain did Louis the Debonnair, instead of raising armies, assemble four councils, in which were made good but useless laws. His sons were in arms; and this, I believe, is the first instance of three sons uniting in a rebellion against their father. The emperor at length prepared to defend himself, and two camps were seen filled with bishops, abbots, and monks; but on the side of the princes

there was Pope Gregory IV. whose name gave great weight to their party. It was already the interest of the popes to humble the emperors. Gregory's predecessor, Stephen, had before this been installed in the pontifical chair without the consent of Louis; and the raising disputes between the father and his children, seemed a ready means of aggrandizing themselves on their ruins. Pope Gregory therefore came into France, and threatened the emperor with excommunication. This ceremony however, did not as yet convey the idea the popes afterwards aimed at annexing to it; for nobody dared to pretend that an excommunicated person was deprived of his fortune by excommunication alone; but they thought of rendering a person execrable, and of separating all the ties that were capable of attaching mankind to him.

The bishops however, who were of the emperor's party, made use of their right, and courageously informed the Pope, that *Si excommunicaturus veniet, excommunicatus abibit*; "If he came to excommunicate, he himself should return excommunicated." They wrote to him with firmness, treated him like a Pope, but at the same time like a brother. Gregory however, with still greater haughtiness, made them the following reply, "The term *brother* is expressive of too great an equality; confine yourselves to that of *Pope*; acknowledge my superiority, and know that the authority of my chair is superior to that of Louis's throne." In short, in his letter he evaded the oath he had taken to the emperor.

At length the war was turned into negotiations. The pontiff set up for arbitrator, and went to meet the emperor in his camp, where he had the same advantage that Louis formerly had over Bernard: he seduced his troops or suffered them to be seduced; he deceived Louis or was himself deceived by the rebels, in whose name he spoke, and scarce had he left the camp when that very night half of the imperial army went over to Lotharius, his son. This desertion happened near Basil, on the borders of Alsace, and the plain where the Pope carried

on

on the
which
place
unha
his re
of th
Charl
cent p
in the
like
had n
peror
causin
Lomb
conve
denne
in reac
feel a
were
author
they h
to Rom
himself
Lot
had be
father
about
forbad
tions c
nances
any be
the pe
should
colour
pose up
him for
Louis
condefo
ness to
Ebbon,
on

on this negociation is still called *the Field of Lies*, a name which might be very properly applied to many other places, in which negociations have been carried on. The unhappy monarch then surrendered himself a prisoner to his rebellious children, with his wife Judith, the object of their hatred; he likewise delivered up to them his son Charles, who was only ten years of age, and the innocent pretext for this war. In more barbarous times, as in the reigns of Clovis and his children, or in countries like Constantinople, I should not be surpris'd if they had murdered Judith and her son, and even the emperor: but the conquerors contented themselves with causing the empress to be shaved and sent to prison in Lombardy; with shutting up young Charles in the convent of Prum, in the midst of the forest of Ardenne; and with dethroning their father. I think that in reading this disaster of a fond parent, we cannot but feel a secret satisfaction, when we find that his sons were equally ungrateful to the Abbot Vala, the first author of these troubles, and to the Pope, by whom they had been so well supported. The Pope went back to Rome, despised by the conquerors, and Vala shut himself up in a monastery in Italy.

Lotharius, who was so much the more culpable, as he had been rais'd to a share of the empire, dragg'd his father as a prisoner to Compiegne. A fatal abuse had about that time been introduced into the church, which forbade the carrying of arms and exercising civil functions during the time of public penance. These penances were seldom practis'd, and scarcely ever fell on any besides some unhappy persons amongst the dregs of the people; yet it was resolv'd, that the emperor should submit to this infamous punishment, under the colour of a voluntary Christian humiliation, and to impose upon him a perpetual penance that would degrade him for ever.

Louis was intimidated, and had the meanness to condescend to this proposal, which they had the boldness to make him. An Archbishop of Rheims, named Ebbon, who, in spite of the laws, had been rais'd by

Louis

Louis himself from a servile condition to this dignity, deposed his sovereign and benefactor. The emperor was obliged to make his appearance, surrounded by thirty bishops, canons, and monks, in the church of Notre Dame at Soissons; and Lotharius was present to enjoy the sight of his father's humiliation. A hair-cloth was spread before the altar; and the archbishop ordered the emperor to take off his belt, sword and coat, and to prostrate himself on the cloth. Louis with his face to the earth, requested the public penance, which he too well deserved for submitting to it. The archbishop forced him to read with a loud voice a paper, in which he accused himself of sacrilege and murder; and the unhappy prince read deliberately a list of his crimes, among which it is expressly mentioned, that he had caused his troops to march in Lent, and had called a parliament on Holy Thursday. A verbal process was drawn up of the whole transaction, which is a monument still subsisting of the extremes of insolence and meanness. In this verbal process they do not condescend to give Louis the title of emperor: but he is there called *Dominus Ludovicus, a nobleman, a venerable person.*

Men are fond of bringing precedents in support of any extraordinary transactions. This penance of Louis the Debonnair, was authorised by the example of a Visigoth King named Vamba, who reigned in Spain in 681. This was the prince who had received the unction at his coronation; but his intellects being impaired, he submitted to a public penance at the council of Toledo, and shut himself up in a cloyster. His successor, Hervicus, had acknowledged that he held his crown of the bishops. This fact was quoted, as if villainy could be justified by example. They likewise alledged the penance of the Emperor Theodosius: but it was a very different case. This Prince had caused fifteen thousand citizens of Thessalonica to be massacred, not in a sudden transport of passion, as is falsely asserted every day in vain panegyrics, but after very mature deliberation. This premeditated crime might have

have
did not
cut.
mittan
prude
people
space
tible
ever d
Lou
vent o
like a
and de
one fo
three
restore
He
Louis
throne
Charle
by ano
of Rhe
was on
empero
altar.
fees; "
could c
It wa
re-estab
belled a
father c
"forgi
"cause
He i
his last
magne
On th
doubts,
is diffic
should n

have drawn on him the resentment of the people, who did not chuse him their sovereign, to have their throats cut. St. Ambrose did a noble action in refusing him admittance into the church, and Theodosius acted very prudently in asswaging in some degree the hatred of the people, by abstaining from public worship during the space of about eight months ; a trifling and contemptible atonement for the most barbarous crime that ever disgraced the memory of a sovereign.

Louis was confined for a year in a cell of the convent of St. Medard at Soissons, cloathed with sackcloth like a penitent, without servants, without consolation, and dead to the rest of the world. If he had had but one son, he would have been lost for ever ; but his three sons quarreling about his spoils, their dissensions restored the father to his liberty and crown.

He was removed to St. Denis, when two of his sons, Louis and Pepin, came to re-establish him on the throne, and to restore to his arms his wife and son Charles. The assembly of Soissons was anathematized by another at Thionville : but this cost the Archbishop of Rheims only the loss of his see ; and that prelate was only tried and deposed in the vestry ; whereas the emperor had been deposed in public at the foot of the altar. Some other bishops were also deprived of their sees ; and this was all the punishment the emperor could or dared to inflict on them.

It was not long before one of the same sons who had re-established him on his throne, Louis of Bavaria, rebelled again. On the news of this revolt, the unhappy father died of grief in a tent near Mentz, saying, " I forgive Louis, but let him know that he has been the cause of my death."

He is said to have confirmed in a solemn manner by his last will, the donation made by Pepin and Charlemagne to the Church of Rome.

On the subject of this confirmation there are the same doubts, as there are concerning the donation itself. It is difficult to believe that Charlemagne and his son should make a present to the Pope of Venice, Sicily, I
Sardinia

Sardinia and Corsica, countries to which they had at farthest only the contested right of sovereign jurisdiction. And when could Louis have given away Sicily, which belonged to the Greek emperors, and was infested by the continual descents of the Arabs?

C H A P. XXIV.

State of Europe after the Death of Louis the Weak, or the Debonnair.—The Separation of Germany from the Frank, or French Empire.

AFTER the death of Charlemagne's son, his empire experienced the same fate as that of Alexander, or as that which we shall soon see beset the Empire of the Caliphs. Having been founded with precipitation, it as hastily declined; it was soon divided by intestine wars.

It is by no means surprising that princes who had dethroned their father, should be desirous of exterminating one another; each was striving to strip his brother. Lotharius, the emperor, would have all. Charles the Bald, King of France, and Louis, King of Bavaria, united their forces against him. A grandson to Louis the Debonnair, the son of Pepin, King of Aquitain, who was king after his father's death, joined Lotharius. These laid the empire waste, and drained it of soldiers. In short, two kings against two kings, three of whom were brothers, and the other their nephew, gave battle at Fontenay in Auxerrois, the horror of which was worthy of a civil war. Many authors assure us, that in this engagement there perished an hundred thousand men. It is true, that these authors were not cotemporaries, and that we ought to have at least the liberty of doubting whether so much blood was spilt. The Emperor Lotharius was overcome. This battle, like so many others, decided nothing. It ought to be mentioned however, that the bishops who fought under

Charles

Charl
throu
would
them
licy,
The
mit to
ing fo
ancien
ligion,
tharius
terest,
which
contin
of Cha
differen
their o
of the
lian fo
Mayor
the Fra
of thre
Lothar
having
membe
peace o
Bald, I
phiny,
Flander
German
It is
begin to
this per
this like
the hatr
of the t
his poss
divisions
made pe
Vol.

Charles and Louis, directed a fast to be observed throughout the army, and prayers for the dead. It would have been more Christian like not to have killed them. Lotharius then set the world an example of policy, altogether different from that of Charlemagne.

The conqueror of the Saxons had made them submit to Christianity as a necessary restraint: their having sometimes revolted, and frequently returned to the ancient worship, was a mark of their aversion to a religion, which they considered as a punishment: but Lotharius, in order to engage them to embrace his interest, gave them an entire liberty of conscience, on which half of the country returned to Idolatry, but continued faithful to the king. This conduct, and that of Charlemagne his grandfather, let people see by what different methods princes make religion subservient to their own interests, and it is on these interests the fate of the world constantly depends. A Frank and a Sallian founded the kingdom of France; and a son of the Mayor or Majordomo Pepin founded the empire of the Franks, which was divided for ever by the quarrels of three brothers. These three unnatural children, Lotharius, Louis of Bavaria and Charles the Bald, after having spilt so much blood at Fontenay, at length dismembered the Empire of Charlemagne by the famous peace of Verdun, by which Charles II. surnamed *the Bald*, had France; Lotharius Italy, Provence, Dauphiny, Languedoc, Switzerland, Lorrain, Alsace, and Flanders; and Louis of Bavaria, surnamed *the Germanic*, Germany.

It is from this æra that the most learned historians begin to give the name of French to the Franks. From this period the Germans may date their private laws; this likewise was the origin of their public laws and of the hatred between the French and the Germans. Each of the three brothers was disturbed in the enjoyment of his possessions by ecclesiastical disputes, and by those divisions which always arise among enemies who have made peace against their inclinations.

It was in the midst of these dissensions that Charles the Bald, the first King of France alone, and Louis the Germanic, the first King of Germany, assembled a council at Aix-la-Chapelle against Lotharius; and this Lotharius was the first Frank Emperor who was stripped of Germany and France.

The prelates by common consent declared Lotharius deprived of his right to the crown, and his subjects released from their oath of fidelity. "Do you promise to govern better than he has done?" said they to the two brothers Charles and Louis: "We promise it," the two kings replied; "And we," said the bishop, who sat as president, "permit you by divine authority, and command you to reign in his stead."

When we see bishops thus disposing of crowns, we are not to suppose that they were then what the electors of the empire are now. They were powerful, indeed, but none of them were sovereigns. The authority of their character, and the respect paid them by the people, were the instruments which kings made use of at pleasure. There was much more weakness than grandeur in these ecclesiastics thus deciding the right of kings, according to the orders they received from those who had the greatest strength.

We ought not to be surprised, that some years after an Archbishop of Sens, with twenty other bishops, presumed in a like conjuncture to depose Charles the Bald, King of France: an action done to please Louis of Bavaria. These monarchs, who were as wicked kings as they were unnatural brothers, not being able to effect their mutual destruction, caused each other to be anathematized by turns; but it is strange, that Charles, in a writing he condescended to publish against the Archbishop of Sens, should say, "At least that archbishop ought not to have deposed me, before I had made my appearance before the bishops who consecrated me king: it was fit that I should have first submitted to their judgment, having been always ready to resign myself to their paternal correction and chastisement." When the race of Char-

lemagne

lemagne
was

I r

in Ge

passed

who v

tiff m

the ac

and a

Lotha

tharius

that to

the Pop

notice

see wa

It se

times

he had

the Po

at Aix-

The

desolat

the Rh

the citi

were ra

nothing

there v

died sw

who ha

afterwar

Toulou

were ma

This

out aga

tharius,

which b

The l

upside

glory, fr

the abb

lemagne was reduced to this humiliating language, it was visibly hurrying to its ruin.

I return to Lotharius, who had always a large party in Germany, and was in quiet possession of Italy. He passed the Alps, caused his son Louis to be crowned, who went to try Pope Sergius II. at Rome. The pontiff made his appearance, answered in a formal manner the accusations of a Bishop of Mentz, justified himself, and afterwards took the oath of fidelity to the same Lotharius who had been deposed by the bishops. Lotharius also made that celebrated and useless decree, that to avoid the seditions, which too frequently arose, *the Pope should be no longer elected by the people*; and that notice should be sent to the emperor whenever the holy see was vacant.

It seems strange that the emperor should be sometimes so humble, and at other times so haughty: but he had an army in the neighbourhood of Rome, when the Pope swore allegiance to him; and he had none at Aix-la-Chapelle, when the bishops dethroned him.

Their sentence was but one scandal more added to the desolations of Europe; the provinces from the Alps to the Rhine no longer knew whom they were to obey: the cities every day changed their tyrants: the villages were ravaged by different parties one after another: nothing was heard of but battles; and in these battles there were always monks, abbots, and bishops, who died sword in hand. Hugh, one of Charlemagne's sons, who had been obliged to turn monk, and who became afterwards Abbot of St. Quintin, was killed before Toulouse, with the Abbot of Ferriere; and two bishops were made prisoners there.

This combustion stopped for a moment, only to break out again with fresh fury. The three brothers, Lotharius, Charles and Louis, made a new division, which became a new source of discontent and war.

The Emperor Lotharius, after having turned Europe upside down, without cause, and without obtaining glory, finding his health declining, became a monk in the abbey of Prum: but he did not wear the habit

above six days, and died an idiot, after having lived a tyrant.

At the death of this third emperor of the West there arose new kingdoms in Europe, like heaps of earth after the shocks of a great earthquake.

Another Lotharius, son of that emperor, gave the name of Lotharinge to a pretty extensive tract of country, since by contraction called *Lorrain*, situated between the Rhine, the Scheld, the Maese, and the sea. Brabant was called *Lower Lorrain*, the rest was *Upper Lorrain*. At present none of this Upper Lorrain goes by that name, but a small province which has been lately swallowed up in the kingdom of France.

A second son of the emperor Lotharius, named Charles, had Savoy, Dauphiny, and a part of Lyonnois, Provence, and Languedoc. This state composed the kingdom of Arles, so called from the name of its capital, once an opulent city, and embellished by the Romans, but at that time poor and insignificant, as were all the cities on this side the Alps.

A barbarian named Solomon, became soon after King of Britany, a part of which was still Pagan; but all these kingdoms fell as quickly as they were raised.

The shadow of the Roman empire still subsisted. Louis, the second son of Lotharius, who had received a part of Italy for his share, was proclaimed Emperor by the Bishop of Rome, Sergius II. in 855. He did not reside at Rome, nor did he possess a ninth part of the empire of Charlemagne: he had only in Italy an authority contested by the Popes and the Dukes of Benevento, who then possessed a considerable territory.

After his death, which happened in 875, if the Salic law had taken effect with respect to the family of Charlemagne, the empire would have belonged to the eldest of that house; and Louis of Germany, the eldest descendant of Charlemagne, would have succeeded his nephew, who died without children; but troops and money constituted the right of Charles the Bald. He shut up the passage of the Alps against his brother, and hastened to Rome with some troops. Reginus,
and

and the annals of Metz and Fuld assure us, that he bought the empire of Pope John VIII. The Pope not only made him pay for this honour, but taking advantage of the conjuncture, gave him the empire with the authority of a sovereign; and Charles received it as his vassal, protesting that he held it of the Pope, as he had before in France, in 859, protested that he ought to submit to the judgment of the bishops; thus constantly degrading his dignity in order to enjoy it.

In his time therefore the Roman empire was composed of France and Italy. It is said that he was poisoned by his physician, a Jew, named Sedecias; but nobody has ever said for what reason his physician committed this crime. What could he get by poisoning his master? From whom could he have procured a better appointment? Besides, as no author mentions any punishment inflicted on the physician, we ought to question the truth of this prince's being poisoned, and content ourselves with reflecting, that the Christians in Europe were so ignorant, that kings were obliged to search for physicians amongst the Jews and Arabians.

This shadow of the Roman empire continued still the object of ambition; and Louis the Stammerer, King of France, the son of Charles the Bald, disputed it with the other descendants of Charlemagne. They likewise asked it of the Pope. A Duke of Spoleto, and a Marquis of Tuscany, who had been invested with these states by Charles the Bald, seized the person of Pope John VIII. and plundered a part of Rome, to force him, as they said, to give the empire to Carloman, King of Bavaria, the eldest of the race of Charlemagne. Pope John VIII. was not only thus persecuted in Rome by the Italians, but was obliged in 877, to pay twenty-five thousand pounds weight of silver to the Mahometans, the possessors of Sicily and the Neapolitan coast. This was the money with which Charles the Bald had purchased the empire. It passed soon after out of the hands of the Pope into those of the Saracens, and the Pope even signed an authentic treaty, by which he engaged to pay them the same sum annually.

However

However this pontiff, who was tributary to the Mahometans, and a prisoner in Rome, escaped, embarked and got into France, where he crowned Louis the Stammerer in the city of Troyes, after the example of Leo III. of Adrian and Stephen III. who were persecuted at home, and bestowed crowns abroad.

Under Charles the Fat, Emperor and King of France, the misery of Europe was redoubled. The more remotely the blood of Charlemagne spread from its source, the more it degenerated. Charles the Fat was declared incapable of reigning by an assembly of French and German lords, who deposed him near Mentz, in a diet called by himself. These were not bishops, who taking advantage of a prince's passions, seemed to dispose of a crown; but the leading persons of the nation, who believed that they had a right to nominate him that was to govern them, and to command at their head. We are told that the intellects of Charles the Fat became weakened; and there is no doubt of it, since he suffered himself to be dethroned without resistance, and thus at once to lose Germany, France, and Italy, and at length to have no other means of subsistence than the charity of the Archbishop of Mentz, who condescended to allow him a maintenance. It seems very plain, that the order of succession was then entirely disregarded, since Arnolph, the bastard of Carloman, son of Louis the Stammerer, was declared emperor, and Eudes, or Odo, Count of Paris, was King of France. There was at that time neither the right of birth, nor the acknowledged right of election: Europe was a chaos, in which the strongest rose upon the ruins of the weakest, in order to be at length thrown down by others.

The whole history of those times is descriptive only of a few barbarous chiefs, who contested with bishops the government of an ignorant people. It would seem as if mankind in those days were deficient in reason and courage, two things which were essentially necessary amidst so many scenes of horror.

C H A P.

T
oper
inha
bari
grat
ture
then
pirac
of p
Men
say i
four
baria
Afric
confi
slaver
newe
count
for bu
two
about
biscui
the co
return
divide
piracy
bary.
and pi
up the
as Tou
the wo
the ch
in shor
off, an

C H A P. XXV.

Of the Normans towards the Ninth Century.

THE whole empire being thus divided, every part of it was weak and unhappy. This confusion opened a passage to the people of Scandinavia, and the inhabitants on the coasts of the Baltick. Those barbarians, who were too numerous, having only an ungrateful soil to cultivate, and being without manufactures, and strangers to the arts, aimed only at spreading themselves far from their native country. Robbery and piracy were as necessary for them as carnage is for beasts of prey. In Germany they were called Normans, or *Men of the North*, without distinction, just as we still say in general, the *Corfsairs of Barbary*. So early as the fourth century they joined the fleets of the other barbarians, who carried desolation even as far as Rome and Africa; yet under Charlemagne we have seen that they confined themselves within their own bounds for fear of slavery. In the time of Louis the Debonnair they renewed their cruizes. The forests with which those countries were over-grown, furnished them with wood for building their barks, which were navigated with two sails and a number of oars, and would contain about an hundred men with their provision of beer, sea-biscuit, cheese, and smoaked meat. They sailed along the coast, landed where they found no resistance, and returned home with their booty, which they afterwards divided among themselves, according to the laws of piracy, in the same manner as is now practised in Barbary. In 843, they entered France by the river Seine, and pillaged the city of Rouen. Another fleet sailed up the Loire, and laid the whole country waste as far as Touraine: they carried the men into slavery, divided the women and girls among themselves, and even took the children to bring them up to their trade of piracy: in short, cattle, furniture, and every thing were carried off, and they sometimes sold on one coast what they had

had pillaged on another. The success of the first adventurers excited the avarice of their indigent countrymen, and these were joined by the inhabitants on the coasts of Germany and Gaul, in the same manner as the renegadoes of Provence and Sicily, have been found serving on board Algerine vessels.

In 844 they covered the sea with their ships, and landed almost at one and the same time in England, France and Spain. It would seem that neither the government of France, nor that of England were so well administered as that of the Mahometans who reigned in Spain; for no measures were taken either by the French or English to prevent these irruptions; whereas in Spain, the Arabians guarded their coasts and at length repulsed the pirates.

In 845 the Normans plundered Hamburgh, and penetrated into Germany. They were no longer a disorderly multitude of corsairs; but a fleet of six hundred vessels that had a regular army on board, with Erick King of Denmark at their head, who gained two battles before he re-imbarked. This king of the pirates after his return home with the spoils of the Germans, sent to France one of the admirals of the corsairs, to whom history gives the name of Regnier, who went up the Seine with an hundred and twenty sail. To all appearance these hundred and twenty vessels did not carry ten thousand men; yet with a number probably still inferior, he pillaged Rouen a second time, and proceeded even to Paris. In such invasions, when the weakness of an administration has provided no remedy, the terror of the people increases the danger, and the greatest number flies before the smallest. The Parisians, who at other times defended themselves with so much courage, abandoned their city, and the Normans found nothing there but wooden houses, which they burnt. The unhappy king, Charles the Bald, retreated with a few troops to St. Denis, and instead of opposing these barbarians, purchased the retreat they condescended to make at the rate of fourteen thousand marks. It is probable that these marks were what were

for

for
abo
read
were
the c
ple
quer
posin
CH
affor
depr
Norm
siege
gave
of th
descen
to ref
Franc
The
time
have
scarce
towns
art of
rians f
varian
cess, so
indeed
with ad
Godf
Fat yie
trated f
passed f
took an
at Paris
The
selves fo
they ha
Paris, w
of Franc
VOL.

for a long time called *marcas*, and which were equal to about half a crown of our money. One is provoked at reading in our authors, that many of these barbarians were punished with sudden death for having pillaged the church of St. Germain-des-prés. Neither the people nor their saints made any defence; but the conquered always had the shameful consolation of supposing miracles performed against their conquerors.

Charles the Bald, in thus purchasing the peace, only afforded the pirates new resources of making war, and deprived himself of the means of supporting it. The Normans made use of this money in carrying on the siege of Bourdeaux, which they plundered; and what gave the finishing stroke to the horror and humiliation of the French, Pepin, King of Aquitain, who was descended from Charlemagne, not finding himself able to resist these barbarians, joined with them; and then France, about the year 858, was entirely ravaged. The Normans strengthened by these allies, for a long time laid waste Germany, Flanders and England. We have lately seen armies of an hundred thousand men scarce able, after very signal victories, to take two towns; so much have the art of fortification, and the art of war been improved: but at that time barbarians fighting against other barbarians, who were at variance among themselves, found, after the first success, scarcely any thing to stop their career; sometimes indeed they were defeated, but they soon returned again with additional strength.

Godfrey, Prince of Denmark, to whom Charles the Fat yielded a part of Holland in the year 882, penetrated from thence into Flanders, when his Normans passed from the Somme to the Oise without resistance, took and burnt Pontoise, and arrived by land and water at Paris.

The Parisians, who had then learnt to prepare themselves for an irruption, did not abandon the capital as they had done formerly. Odo or Eudes, Count of Paris, whose valour afterwards raised him to the throne of France, made such regulations in the city, as ani-

mated their courage, and served them instead of towers and ramparts. Sigefroy, who commanded the Normans, pressed the siege with an obstinate fury, and not without a certain degree of military skill. The Normans made use of the battering ram to beat down the walls. This invention is almost of as ancient a date as walls themselves; for men in general are as industrious to destroy as to raise up. And here I must beg leave to digress from my subject for a moment, to observe, that the Trojan horse was nothing more than a similar engine, to which was fixed an horse's head of brass, in like manner as they afterwards made use of the head of a ram. This we are told by Pausanias in his History of Greece. They effected a breach, and gave three assaults, which the Parisians sustained with unshaken courage. They had at their head not only Count Eudes, but also Goslin their bishop, who every day, after he had bestowed his benedictions on the people, repaired to the breach, with a helmet on his head, a quiver of arrows on his back, and an ax at his girdle, and having planted the cross on the rampart, fought with it in his fight. This bishop appears to have had at least as much authority in the city as Count Eudes; since Sigefroy first addressed himself to him, to obtain a permission to enter Paris: however, the prelate died of fatigue in the midst of the siege, leaving a memory equally dear and respectable; for though he armed those hands which religion reserved solely for the service of the altar, yet he armed them for that altar itself, and for his fellow citizens, in the justest cause, and for the most necessary defence, the first law of nature, which is always superior to every other law. His brethren had only armed themselves in civil wars, and against Christians: but if an apotheosis is due to any man, this prelate who fought and died for his country, had perhaps a much better right to a place in heaven, than such numbers of obscure persons, whose virtue, if they had any, was generally of no service to the world.

The

The Normans blocked up the city a year and a half, during which time the Parisians experienced all the horrors that attend a long siege, such as famine and pestilence, and yet remained unshaken. At length the Emperor Charles the Fat, King of France, appeared on the Mount of Mars, now called Montmartre; but not daring to attack the Normans, he only came to purchase another shameful truce. These barbarians left Paris to go and besiege Sens, and plunder Burgundy; while Charles went to Mentz, to assemble a parliament that deprived him of a throne of which he was so unworthy.

The Normans continued their devastations; but though they were enemies to the Christian name, they never attempted to force any one to renounce Christianity. They nearly resembled the Franks, the Goths, the Alans, the Huns, and the Heruli, who in the fourth century fought for new settlements, and were so far from imposing a religion on the Romans, that they easily accommodated themselves to theirs: thus the Turks, in plundering the empire of the Caliphs, submitted to the Mahometan religion.

At length Rollo, or Raoul, the most illustrious of these northern robbers, after being driven from Denmark, assembled in Scandinavia all those who were willing to attach themselves to his fortune; and founding the hopes of his future grandeur on the weakness of Europe, he attempted new adventures. He landed first in England, where his countrymen were already established; but after two useless victories, he steered his course towards France, which other Normans had ruined, but had not been able to enslave.

Rollo was the only one of his countrymen, who by seeking for a fixed establishment, ceased to deserve the name of barbarian. Having made himself master of Rouen without difficulty, instead of destroying it he caused its walls and towers to be rebuilt. Rouen became his arsenal from whence he made his excursions into England or France, carrying on his wars with equal

equal policy and fury. France was expiring under the reign of Charles the Simple, who was a king only in name and whose monarchy was even more dismembered, by the dukes, counts, and barons, his subjects, than by the Normans. Charles the Fat had given gold to the barbarians; but Charles the Simple offered to Rollo his daughter and his provinces.

Rollo began with demanding Normandy, and Charles thought himself happy in getting off so cheap. He afterwards demanded Britany; this was disputed, but Charles was obliged to give up this too with certain clauses, which the strongest always explains to his own advantage. Thus Britany, which a little before had been a kingdom, was made a fief to Neustria; and Neustria, which soon afterwards was called Normandy from the name of its usurpers, was made a separate state, the dukes of which paid an empty homage to the crown of France.

The Archbishop of Rouen prevailed on Rollo to turn Christian; and this prince readily embraced a religion that tended to confirm his power.

They only are true conquerors who know how to make laws: their power is durable; the others are torrents that pass away. Rollo after a time was at peace, and became the only legislator of his time on the Christian continent. It is well known with what inflexibility he administered justice. He abolished theft and robbery amongst his Danes, who had hitherto lived only on rapine; and for a long time after his decease, the sole pronouncing of his name was an order to the officers of justice to run to suppress any act of violence: from thence comes the custom of calling *Haro*, so well known in Normandy. The blood of the Danes and Franks being intermixed, at length produced those heroes, whom we shall see conquering England, Naples and Sicily.

CHAP.

C H A P. XXVI.

Of England towards the Ninth Century, and of Alfred the Great.

THE English, a people who are become so powerful, who are famous for commerce and war, and who are so attached to their laws, and to true liberty which consists in their obedience of those laws, were at that time nothing to what they are at present.

They had no sooner got rid of the Roman yoke, than they fell a prey to the Saxons, who after making the conquest of England towards the sixth century, were in the eighth subdued by Charlemagne in their own country. These usurpers divided the country into seven little districts called kingdoms; which were at length reunited under King Egbert of the Saxon line, when the Normans came to ravage England as well as France. It is pretended, that in 852, they sailed up the Thames with three hundred vessels, when the English did not defend themselves much better than the Franks had done; but like them paid their conquerors. A king named Ethelbert followed the unhappy example of Charles the Bald: he gave them money; and the same fault had the same punishment: for the pirates made use of this money to subdue the country. They brought one half of England under subjection. As the English are naturally brave, and defended by their situation, there must have been very essential defects in their government, since they were generally subdued even by people who ought not even to have invaded them with impunity. The accounts of the dreadful devastations committed in this island, exceed even the horrid scenes we have just now seen in France. It would seem as if there were particular periods in which the whole earth is destined to be a scene of carnage.

It is an agreeable respite to the reader, when amidst such horrors he sees a great man arise to rescue his country from slavery, and govern it like a good king.

Perhaps

Perhaps there never was a man upon earth more deserving of the regard of posterity than Alfred the Great, who bestowed these services on his country, supposing all that has been said of him to be true.

He succeeded his brother Ethelred I. who left him only a contested right to the crown of England, divided more than ever into petty sovereignties, several of which were in the possession of the Danes. Almost every year there was an inundation of new pirates, who disputed the few remaining spoils with the first usurpers.

Alfred having only a single province in the West that stood firm to his interest, was at first vanquished by those barbarians in a pitched battle, and deserted by every body. He did not retire however to Rome, as his uncle Butred had done, who had been king of a small province, from which he was expelled by the Danes; but alone and unassisted he resolved to perish, or to revenge his country's cause. He concealed himself during the space of six months in a shepherd's hut surrounded with a morass; and the Earl of Devon alone, who still defended a weak castle against the usurpers, was in the secret. At length this earl having assembled a few troops, and gained some little advantage over the enemy, Alfred, disguised in a shepherd's tattered dress, ventured to appear in the midst of the Danish army playing upon the harp. In this manner he observed the situation and defects of their camp, and being informed of a festival which the barbarians were shortly to celebrate, he returned with all expedition to the Earl of Devon, whose troops were ready; and marching against the Danes with this small but resolute body of forces, he surprized the enemy, and gained a compleat victory. The Danes were divided by party disputes. Alfred knew how to negotiate as well as to fight; and what is strange, both the English and Danes unanimously acknowledged him for their king. He now had nothing more to do than to make himself master of London, which he took, and after having fortified this city, he improved it with good buildings:

he

he th
hinde
he en
years
but f
juries
and w
ships
far as
of Suc
He re
diffuse
throug
Wh
genera
view t
Europ
of such
lated i
Count
XIV.
tempt
Englis
to us h
he live
Ther
not a g
sity of
land wa
at that
one Eng
his part
even a t
lived in
said tha
guage;
administ
A prude
find that
nastery.

he then fitted out fleets, kept the Danes in awe, and hindered the others from making a descent; after which he employed himself, during a peaceable reign of twelve years, in civilizing his country. His laws were mild, but strictly executed. It was he who first established juries, who divided England into shires or counties, and who first encouraged his subjects to trade. He lent ships and money to prudent adventurers, who went as far as Alexandria, and from thence passing the isthmus of Suez, extended their commerce to the Persian Gulf. He regulated the militia, erected several councils, and diffused regularity, and peace, its natural attendant, through every part of his kingdom.

Who would have supposed that in such times of general ignorance, a ship was sent by this Alfred with a view to discover a passage to India by the North of Europe and Asia? and yet it is certain that an account of such a voyage, written in Anglo-Saxon, was translated into Latin at Copenhagen at the request of the Count de Plelo, who was ambassador there from Louis XIV. Alfred was the first author of these bold attempts which have been made in later times by the English, the Dutch, and the Russians. This proves to us how superior this prince was to the age in which he lived.

There never yet existed a truly great man who had not a good understanding. Alfred founded the university of Oxford, and sent to Rome for books; for England was so barbarous a country as to have scarce any at that time. He used to complain that there was not one English priest who even understood Latin: yet for his part he was no stranger to this language; he was even a tolerable geometrician, considering the time he lived in, and was well versed in history. It is also said that he composed verses in the Anglo-Saxon language; for what little time he could spare from the administration of public affairs he consecrated to study. A prudent œconomy enabled him to be liberal. We find that he rebuilt several churches, but not one monastery. Doubtless he was of opinion that in a ravaged state,

state, which he was under a necessity of re-peopling, he would have done no service to his country, in giving too much encouragement to those immense families, which without parents or children perpetuate themselves at the expence of the nation. Hence he was never ranked in the catalogue of saints; but history, which accuses him neither of vice nor weakness, places him in the first ranks of those heroes so useful to the human race, who, without such extraordinary men, would never have risen above the level of savage beasts.

C H A P. XXVII.

Of Spain and the Moors in the Eighth and Ninth Centuries.

YOU have already had occasion to observe states unfortunate and badly governed; but Spain, whose portrait we are now about to exhibit, was for a long time subject to the most deplorable calamities. The barbarians who over-run the greatest part of Europe in the beginning of the fifth century, desolated this as well as other countries. But how happened it that Spain, who defended herself so bravely against the Romans, became so suddenly a prey to the barbarians? It was because she abounded in patriots at the time she was attacked by the Romans, but under the yoke of that republic her people degenerated into slaves, who were ill treated by their effeminate masters, and she soon fell a victim to the Suevi, the Goths, and the Vandals. After the Vandals came the Visigoths, who began to establish themselves in Aquitaine and Catalonia, while the Ostrogoths were destroying the Roman empire in Italy. These Ostrogoths and Visigoths were, as we know, Christians; not of the Roman church however, nor of that of the Emperors of the East, but of the communion which had long been received by the Greek church, and which believed in Christ, but without admitting his equality with God. The Spaniards, on the contrary, were attached to the rites

of the Roman church; so that the conquerors were of one religion and the conquered of another, and this did not a little contribute to render the yoke of the latter more heavy. The dioceses were divided between Arian bishops and Athanasian bishops, as in Italy; a division which still added to the sufferings of the people. The Visigoth kings wanted to do the same thing in Spain as we have seen done by the Lombard king Lotharius in Italy, and which Constantine did at his accession to the empire; and this was to unite by a liberty of conscience people who were divided by their different tenets.

The Visigoth king, Leuvigildus, aimed at bringing together those who believed in consubstantiality, and those who were of a different belief. His son Herminigildus rebelled against him. There was at that time a petty king of the Suevi, who was in possession of Galicia, and of some places in that neighbourhood. The rebellious son made an alliance with this king of the Suevi, and carried on a war against his father for a long time. At length, after refusing all invitations to return to his duty, he was defeated and taken prisoner in Cordova, where he was put to death by one of his father's officers. The church of Rome has canonized him, considering in him only the Catholic religion, which was the pretext of his revolt. This memorable event happened in 584, and I relate it only as an instance of the unhappy state to which Spain was at that time reduced.

The kingdom of the Visigoths was not hereditary. The bishops, who had then the same authority in Spain as they had acquired in France under the Carlovingian family, made and deposed kings at their pleasure in conjunction with the principal nobility. This became a new source of endless disturbances; for example, they elected the bastard Liuva to the prejudice of his brothers, who were legitimate; and this Liuva having been assassinated by a Gothic captain named Witteric, they elected this Witteric without difficulty.

One of their best kings, named Vamba, of whom we have already spoken, having fallen sick, was clad in sackcloth, and submitted to do public penance, which would not fail, he was told, to cure him. He recovered indeed, but in quality of penitent he was declared incapable of the functions of royalty, and was confined seven days in a monastery. This precedent was quoted in France, at the deposition of Louis the Debonnair.

The first Gothic conquerors who subjected Spain, did not suffer themselves to be treated in this manner. They founded an empire which extended from Provence and Languedoc in Europe, to Ceuta and Tangier in Africa; but this empire being badly governed, soon fell to ruin. There were so many rebellions in Spain, that at length King Vitiza disarmed a part of his subjects, and destroyed the walls of several towns. By these means he enforced obedience, but at the same time put it out of their power to assist him. In order to gain the clergy to his side, he issued an edict in an assembly of the nation, by which bishops and priests were permitted to marry.

Roderic, whose father he had assassinated, assassinated him in his turn, and even surpassed him in wickedness. We find here the cause of the superiority of the Mussulmen in Spain. I am not certain of its being a real fact that Roderic violated Florinda, called *Cava*, or the *bad*, the unfortunately celebrated daughter of Count Julian; and whether it was to revenge her honour that this count called in the Moors. Perhaps the adventure of *Cava* is in some measure copied from that of Lucretia, and neither the one nor the other seem to be well authenticated. One would think that to call in the Africans there was no occasion for the pretext of a rape, which is generally as difficult to prove as to commit. Count Ervigius, who was afterwards king, had before that time, during the reign of Vamba, brought over an army of Moors. Opas, archbishop of Seville, the principal instrument of this great revolution,

volution, had more important interests to support than those of a lady's chastity. This bishop, the son of the usurper Vitiza, who had been dethroned and assassinated by the usurper Roderic, was the person whose ambition invited the Moors a second time. Count Julian, the son-in-law of Vitiza, found in this alliance sufficient reasons for rising against the tyrant. Another bishop, named Torizo, joined in the conspiracy with Opas and the count. Is it likely that two bishops would have confederated in this manner with the enemies of Christianity, if a girl had been the only subject in dispute?

It is certain however, that the Mahometans were then, as they still are, masters of all that part of Africa formerly subject to the Romans, and had lately founded the city of Morocco in the neighbourhood of Mount Atlas. The caliph Valid Almanzor, sovereign of that fruitful part of the world, resided at Damascus in Syria. His viceroys Muzza, who was governor of Africa, made the conquest of all Spain by the means of one of his lieutenants. He sent thither at first his general named Tariff, who in 714 won that memorable battle in which Roderic lost his life. It is pretended that the Saracens did not keep their word with Julian, whom they certainly mistrusted. But the archbishop Opas had more reason to be satisfied with them; for he swore allegiance to the Mahometans, and under their protection he preserved a considerable authority over the Christian churches, which were tolerated by the conquerors.

As to King Roderic, he was so little regretted, that his widow Egilona publicly espoused young Abdalis, son of the conqueror Muzza, whose arms had destroyed her husband and enslaved her country and religion.

The conquerors did not make an ill use of the success of their arms. Contenting themselves with a tribute, and the honour of being masters, they left the conquered in quiet possession of their lands, laws, and worship; and not only the widow of King Roderic married young Abdalis, but, after her example, the blood of the Moors and Spaniards was frequently

mingled. The Spaniards, who have since been so scrupulously attached to their religion, quitted it in great number, in order to obtain the name of Mosarabians, which signified Half-Arabians, instead of that of Visigoths, which their nation had borne before that period. There was nothing mortifying to the vanquished in this name of Mosarabians, as the Arabians were the mildest of all conquerors, and brought new arts and sciences with them into Spain.

In the space of fourteen months Spain was subjected to the empire of the Caliphs, excepting the rocks and caverns of Asturia. A Goth, named Pelagius Teudomer, who was a relation of the last King Roderick, concealed himself in some of those retreats and preserved his liberty. I know not how they could give the name of king to this prince, although he was perhaps really worthy of that dignity; since his whole royalty consisted in not being a captive. The Spanish historians, and those who have copied after them, pretend he obtained very signal victories, imagine miracles in his favour, establish a court for him, and mention his son Favila, and his son-in-law Alphonso, as peaceable successors to this pretended kingdom. But is it likely that the Mahometans, who under Abderamen towards the year 734, had subdued one half of France, should permit this kingdom of Asturia to subsist behind the Pyrenees? It was a great point for the Christians to be able to take shelter in those mountains, and to live there by their incursions, paying tribute to the Mahometans. It was not till towards 759 that the Christians began to make head against their conquerors, who had been weakened by the victories of Charles Martel and their own intestine divisions: but the Christians becoming still more divided among themselves than the Mahometans, soon relapsed under their former yoke. Mauregat, whom the historians have been pleased to honour with the title of king, was suffered to govern Asturia and some other neighbouring territories, upon condition of paying homage and tribute. He particularly engaged to furnish Abderamen, with an hundred beautiful damsels

every

every year for his seraglio. It was for a long time the custom of the Arabians to exact similar tributes, and even now, the caravans, in their presents to the Arabians of the desert, always include a certain number of girls who are marriageable.

As successor to this Mauregat they mention a deacon, named Veremond, chief of those highland refugees, who yielded the same homage, and paid the same tribute of beautiful virgins. Is this a kingdom, and can such as these be called kings?

After the decease of Abderamen, the emirs of the Spanish provinces wanted to be independent. We have seen in the article of Charlemagne, that one of them, whose name was Ibna, had the imprudence to call in this conqueror to his assistance. If there had been at that time really a Christian kingdom in Spain, would not Charles have protected this kingdom by his arms, rather than join his forces to the Mahometans? He took this emir under his protection, and made him yield homage for the lands situate between the Ebro and the Pyrenees, which the Mahometans then possessed. In 794, we find that the Moor Abutar paid homage to Louis the Debonnair, who governed Aquitaine under his father with the title of king.

Some time afterwards the divisions began to increase among the Moors of Spain: and the council of Louis the Debonnair made a proper use of this conjuncture: for his troops besieged Barcelona during two whole years, and in 796 Louis himself entered the city in triumph. From this period we may date the decline of the Moors. Those conquerors were no longer supported by the Africans and the Caliphs, whose yoke they had shaken off. The successors of Abderamen having established their residence at Cordova, were but indifferently obeyed by the governors of the other provinces.

At this happy conjuncture, Alphonso, of the race of Pelagius, began to render the name of those Spanish Christians considerable, who had retired into the mountains of Asturia. He refused to pay the usual
tribute

tribute to masters whom he was now able to fight; and after a few victories he saw himself in peaceable possession of Asturia and Leon in the beginning of the ninth century.

It was by this prince that the succession of Christian kings was revived in Spain. He was artful and cruel; they gave him the name of the *chaste*, for being the first that refused to pay the tribute of the hundred virgins to the Moors. People do not reflect that he did not engage in this war merely because he had refused the payment of this tribute; but because as he was determined to throw off the Moorish yoke, and to be no longer tributary, it was incumbent upon him to refuse the hundred damsels, as well as every other acknowledgment of subjection.

Alphonso's success, notwithstanding the many difficulties he had to encounter, encouraged the Christians of Navarre to give themselves a king. The inhabitants of Arragon likewise took up arms under a certain count; so that towards the end of Louis the Debonair's reign, neither the Moors nor the French had any possessions in those barren provinces; but the rest of Spain was still governed by Mahometan kings. Then it was that the Normans ravaged the coast of Spain; but meeting with a repulse, they turned back and plundered France and England.

It is no wonder that the Spaniards of Asturia, Leon and Arragon, were at that time in a state of barbarism. The state of warfare, which succeeded their servitude, was far from polishing their manners. They lived in such profound ignorance, that Alphonso, surnamed the Great, King of Leon and Asturia, was obliged to entrust the education of his son to Mahometan preceptors.

One cannot help being astonished at the profusion with which historians lavish away titles on kings. This Alphonso, whom they stile the Great, put out the eyes of his four brothers; and his whole life was one continued series of cruelty and deceit. He closed the

scene with forcing his subjects to revolt, and was obliged to resign his little kingdom to his son Don Garcias in the year 910.

This title of Don is an abridgement of Dominus, a title which the Emperor Augustus considered as too ambitious, because it signified master. It was afterwards given to the Benedictine monks, then to the noblemen of Spain, and lastly to the kings of that country. The lords of fiefs then first began to assume the title of *Ricos-hombres*, or *Rich-men*; rich signifying he who had great possessions in land, the only wealth the Christians in Spain possessed at that time. The dignity of Grandee was not then known, nor was that title in use till three centuries afterwards, in the reign of Alphonso, tenth of that name, King of Castile, at which time Spain began to be in a flourishing condition.

C H A P. XXVIII.

Of the Power of the Mahometans in Asia and Europe in the eighth and ninth Centuries.—Italy attacked by them.—Magnanimous Conduct of Pope Leo IV.

THE Mahometans who had lost that part of Spain which borders on France, were extending their arms in every other part. If I consider their religion, I find it embraced all over India, and upon the eastern coasts of Africa to which they traded. If I look upon their conquests, I find that the Caliph Aaron-al-Rachid, or the Wise; at first imposed a yearly tribute of seventy thousand crowns upon the Empress Irene. The Emperor Nicephorus having refused to pay this tribute, Aaron reduced the isle of Cyprus and desolated Greece. Almamon, his grandson, a prince in other respects so celebrated for his learning, made himself master of the island of Creti in 826, by means of his lieutenants. The Musulmen founded the city of Candia which they have retaken in our times.

In

In the year 828, the same Africans who had subdued Spain, made incursions into the fruitful island of Sicily, encouraged by a Sicilian, whose name was Euphemius: this man having followed the Emperor Michael's example in marrying a nun, and being prosecuted by the laws, whose authority the emperor had evaded, acted very near the same tragedy in Sicily as Count Julian had done before in Spain.

Neither the Greek emperors nor those of the West, were at that time able to drive the Mahometans out of Sicily; so badly was the government of the two empires administered. These conquerors would have made themselves masters of Italy, if they had been united; but their dissensions saved Rome, as it had been saved in former times by those of the Carthaginians. They set sail from Sicily in 846, with a numerous fleet, entered the mouth of the Tiber, and finding the country almost all depopulated, they went and laid siege to Rome. They made themselves masters of the suburbs, and after plundering the rich church of St. Peter that stood without the walls, they raised the siege in order to give battle to a French army, which was marching to the relief of Rome, under the command of one of the Emperor Lotharius's generals. The French army was beaten, but the city, having received a supply of provisions during their absence, was saved; so that this expedition, which in all probability would have ended in a conquest, by their own misunderstandings proved no better than an incursion of barbarians. They returned soon after with a formidable army, which seemed to threaten the destruction of Italy, and to turn the capital of christendom into a Mahometan town. In this critical conjuncture Pope Leo IV. assuming an authority, which the Emperor Lotharius's generals seemed to abandon, shewed himself by the manner in which he defended Rome, worthy of being its sovereign. He employed the treasures of the church in repairing the walls, raising towers, and stretching iron chains across the Tiber. He armed the militia at his own expence, and engaged the inhabitants of Naples and Gaeta to

come

com
neg
then
cien
to h
the S
page
press
Chri
secur
the c
be rev
like c
which
city.
they
landin
perfec
shipw
his vi
barbar
Rome
public
still c
and G
sairs,
In
metans
stantin
whole
three-f
constit
tending
one pe
Und
815, a
became
sidence
Tingita
Vol.

come and defend the coasts and port of Ostia, without neglecting the prudent precaution of taking hostages of them, knowing perfectly well that they who have sufficient strength to assist, are frequently powerful enough to hurt. He visited every post himself, and received the Saracens at their descent, not in a military equipage, as Gossin, bishop of Paris, had done on a more pressing occasion, but as a pontiff that exhorted a Christian people, and as a king that watched over the security of his subjects. He was a Roman by birth; and the courage of the early ages of the republic, seemed to be revived in him, at a time of cowardice and corruption, like one of the beautiful monuments of ancient Rome, which are sometimes found in the ruins of the modern city. His courage and care were seconded by his people; they gave a warm reception to the Saracens upon their landing; and one half of their ships having been dispersed by a tempest, such of the invaders as had escaped shipwreck were reduced to slavery. The Pope rendered his victory the more useful, by employing those very barbarians that were come to demolish the walls of Rome, in repairing the fortifications and improving the public edifices of the city. The Mahometans however, still continued in possession of Garillan between Capua and Gaieta, but rather as a colony of independent corsairs, than disciplined conquerors.

In the ninth century therefore, we find the Mahometans become formidable both to Rome and to Constantinople, masters of Persia, Syria and Arabia, of the whole coast of Africa as far as mount Atlas, and of three-fourths of Spain. But these conquerors did not constitute one nation, as the Romans, who in extending their arms almost as far, still composed only one people.

Under the famous Caliph Almamon, about the year 815, a little after the death of Charlemagne, Egypt became independent, and another caliph fixed his residence at Grand Cairo. The Prince of Mauritania Tingitana, under the title of *Miramolin*, was absolute

sovereign of the empire of Morocco. Nubia and Lybia were subject to another *caliph*. The Abderamens, who had founded the kingdom of Cordova, could not hinder other Mahometans from erecting that of Toledo. All these new dynasties revered in the person of their caliph, the successor of their prophet. Thus as the Christians crowded in pilgrimage to Rome, the Mahometans from all parts of the world flocked to Mecca, which was governed by a *sberif*, whom the caliph appointed; and it was principally on account of this pilgrimage that the caliph, as master of Mecca, was revered by all the princes of his persuasion. But these princes, distinguishing between religion and their political interests, divested the caliph of his power while they affected to pay him homage.

C H A P. XXIX.

Of the Empire of Constantinople in the eighth and ninth Centuries.

AT a time when the empire of Charlemagne was falling into decay, and the western world was laid waste by the inundations of the Saracens and the Normans, the empire of Constantinople subsisted like a large tree, still vigorous, though old and stripped of some of its roots, and assailed on every side by violent storms. This empire had nothing left in Africa, and had lost Syria with part of Asia Minor. It still defended its frontiers against the Mahometans towards the eastern coast of the Black Sea; and fighting with alternate success it might at least have maintained its ground, by being always inured to war. But on the western shores of the Black Sea, and towards the Danube, it was ravaged by other enemies. A Scythian nation, called Abari, or Avari, the Bulgarians likewise, another tribe of Scythians, from whom Bulgaria has taken its name, laid waste the fruitful province of Romania, in which

which Adrian and Trajan had built so many fine cities, and those high roads of which there are only a few causeways now remaining.

The Abari, more particularly, who were dispersed in Hungary and in Austria, sometimes made incursions into the eastern empire, and at other times invaded that of Charlemagne. Thus from the borders of Persia to those of France, the earth was exposed to almost continual incursions.

While the frontiers of the Greek empire were every day straitened and desolated, the capital was a theatre of revolutions and crimes. A mixture of Greek cunning and Thracian ferocity, constituted the reigning character at court. In fact, what a horrid spectacle does Constantinople exhibit to our view? Maurice and his five children massacred: Phocas assassinated in punishment for his murders and incests: Constantine poisoned by the Empress Martina, whose tongue was plucked out while they cut off the nose of her son Heracleonas: Constans assassinating his brother, and he himself afterwards murdered by his servants in a bath; Constantine Pogonatus putting out the eyes of both his brothers: his son Justinian II. who was very near doing at Constantinople what Theodosius had before done at Thessalonica, seized, mutilated, and laid in irons by Leontius, at the very moment he was going to massacre the principal citizens: Leontius soon after treated in the same manner as he had treated Justinian II. this Justinian reinstated, feasting his eyes with the blood of his enemies in the public forum, and dying at length by the hands of an executioner: Philip Bardanes dethroned and condemned to lose his sight: Leo Isaurus, and Constantine Copronymus dying indeed in their beds, but after a sanguinary reign, equally disgraceful to the prince, and fatal to the subjects: the Empress Irene, the first woman that ascended the throne of the Cæsars, and the first that made her way to it by murdering her son. Nicephorus her successor, detested by his subjects, taken prisoner by the Bulgarians, beheaded, his body exposed to beasts, and

his scull converted into a cup for his conqueror: in fine, the emperor Michael Curopalatus, coteremporary of Charlemagne, confined in a monastery, and dying less cruelly indeed, but more ignominiously than his predecessors. Thus the empire was governed during the space of three hundred years. Where is there an account of obscure robbers, publicly executed for their crimes, that can be more horrid and more disgusting?

Still however we must proceed: in the ninth century, we see Leo the Armenian, a brave warrior, but an enemy to images, assassinated at mass while he was singing an anthem: his murderers, who gloried in having destroyed an heretic, repaired to the public jail to release an officer named Michael the Stammerer, who had been condemned to death by the senate, but instead of being executed was invested with the imperial diadem. This was the prince, who falling in love with a nun, caused the senate to intreat him to marry her, which was done without any of the bishops daring to oppose it. The fact is the more deserving of our attention, as we have an instance almost at the same time of Euphemius being persecuted in Sicily for a similar marriage, and as the legitimate marriage of the Emperor Leo the philosopher was condemned not long afterwards at Constantinople. Where is the country then that could boast of laws and manners? None surely in our western part of the world.

The ancient dispute about images still disturbed the empire. The court sometimes favoured and sometimes opposed the worship of them, according to the general bent of the people. Michael the Stammerer began with consecrating images, and closed his reign with demolishing them.

His successor Theophilus, who reigned about twelve years, from 829 to 842, declared against this worship. It has been asserted that he did not believe the resurrection, that he denied the existence of a devil, and that he did not acknowledge the divinity of Christ. It is possible that an emperor might have been of such a way of thinking; but are we to take the character, I
will

will not say of princes, but even of private men, upon the evidence of their enemies, who, without producing proof of any one fact, decry the religion and morals of men who happened not to be of their opinion?

This Theophilus, son of Michael the Stammerer, was almost the only emperor who had peaceably succeeded his father for two centuries. Under him the image-worshippers were more persecuted than ever. It is easy to conceive that by these long persecutions the sentiments of the people were divided.

It is observable, that two women were the restorers of images. One was the Empress Irene, widow of Leo IV. and the other the Empress Theodora, widow of Theophilus.

Theodora, who governed the eastern empire during the minority of her son Michael, persecuted the enemies of image-worship in her turn: she even carried her zeal or policy to a greater length. There were still a great number of Manicheans in Asia Minor, who lived quietly, because the fury of enthusiasm, which usually rages only among new sects, was then spent. These people had enriched themselves by commerce; and whether their opinions or their estates were aimed at, this is certain, that the court published severe edicts against them, which were executed with the utmost cruelty. The persecution served only to revive their original fanaticism; so that many thousands of them died under torments, and the rest growing desperate, took up arms and revolted. Above 40,000 of them went over to the Mahometans; and these Manicheans, who before that time had been such peaceable subjects, became implacable enemies of the empire, and joining with the Saracens, ravaged all Asia Minor up to the very gates of the imperial city, which had been depopulated by a dreadful pestilence in 842, so as to be an object of pity.

The plague, strictly so called, is, as well as the small-pox, a disease peculiar to Africa, and from thence it is always communicated by merchant ships. It would certainly ravage all Europe, were it not for the
wise

wise precautions that are taken in our ports; and probably it was through want of attention in the government, that this contagion made its way into the imperial city.

This very inattention exposed the empire to another scourge. The Russians embarked at the port, now called Asoph, and ravaged all the coasts of the Euxine sea. On the other hand, the Arabs pushed their conquests beyond Armenia, and as far as Asia Minor. At length Michael the Young, after a cruel and unfortunate reign, was assassinated by Basilus, whom he had raised from a very mean station, and made his associate in the empire.

The administration of Basilus was not much happier. This reign is the æra of the great schism which separated the Greek from the Latin church. This is the assassin who was thought just when he deposed the patriarch Photius.

The misfortunes of the empire were not much relieved under Leo, who was stiled the philosopher; not because he was an Antoninus, a Marcus Aurelius, a Julian, an Aaron-Al-Rachid, or an Alfred, but because he was a man of learning. He is said to have been the first that opened the way for the Turks, who a long time afterwards made themselves masters of Constantinople.

Had the Turks (who after fighting against the Saracens, united themselves with these people, and supported them in destroying the Greek empire) already sent colonies into the countries bordering on the Danube? We have scarce any true history of these emigrations of barbarians.

It would seem as if mankind lived in this manner during many age. Scarce had a country received a little cultivation, but it was invaded by a hungry people, who were driven from thence in their turn by some other nation. Did not the Gauls make a descent upon Italy? and did not they penetrate as far as Asia Minor? And have not twenty different tribes come from Great Tartary in search of new lands? Did not

the Swifs set fire to their villages in order to remove into Languedoc, when Cæſar compelled them to return and till their grounds? And what were Pharamond and Clovis but barbarians who had tranſplanted themſelves, and who were fortunate enough not to meet with a Cæſar?

But notwithstanding ſo many diſaſters, Conſtantinople ſtill for a long time continued, of all the cities in Chriſtendom, the moſt opulent, the moſt populous, and the moſt celebrated for the polite arts. Its very ſituation, by which it has the command of two ſeas, neceſſarily rendered it a place of trade. The plague in 842, though ſo greatly deſtructive, was only a tranſitory ſcourge. Cities where commerce flouriſhes, and a court reſides, are eaſily repeopled from the neighbouring provinces. Neither the mechanic nor the liberal arts are in danger of being loſt in a great metropolis, where the wealth of the nation generally centers.

Theſe ſudden revolutions of ſtate, and the barbarities of ſo many emperors maſſacred by one another, are ſtorms which ſeldom fall on men in retirement, who quietly cultivate ſuch profeſſions as do not attract the envy of the great.

The riches of the empire were not exhausted: it is ſaid, that in 857, Theodora, mother of the Emperor Michael, who reſigned the regency againſt her will, and was treated nearly in the ſame manner by her ſon, as Mary of Medicis was in our days by Louis XIII. gave the emperor to underſtand, that there was in the exchequer an hundred and nine thouſand pounds weight of gold, and three hundred thouſand pounds of ſilver.

A prudent adminiſtration might therefore have ſtill been able to ſupport the empire. It was contracted but not diſmembered, and though frequently changing emperors, yet always united under the perſon inveſted with the purple. In ſhort, it was richer, had more internal reſources, and greater power than that of Germany; yet it is no more, and the German empire ſtill ſubſiſts.

The

The revolutions we have been relating are at once horrid and disgustful; and yet it is certain that from the time of Constantine, surnamed the Great, the empire of Constantinople had seldom been governed in any other manner; and if we except Julian and two or three others, there was not a single emperor who did not disgrace the throne by his infamy and crimes.

C H A P. XXX.

Of Italy and the Popes.—Of the Divorce of Lotharius King of Lorrain, and the other Affairs of the Church in the eighth and ninth Centuries.

THAT we may not lose the thread of our history in such a multitude of events, let us remember, how prudently the Popes conducted themselves under Pepin and Charlemagne, how dextrously they stifled all religious quarrels, and in what manner each of them insensibly established the foundations of the pontifical grandeur.

Their power was already grown very considerable, since Gregory IV. repaired the port of Ostia, and Leo IV. fortified Rome at their own expense. But every Pope could not be a great man, nor could every conjuncture be favourable to their views. Each vacancy of the papal see produced almost as many commotions as the election of a king does in Poland. The Pope elect, was obliged at the same time to keep fair with the Roman senate, with the people, and the emperor. The Roman nobility had a great share in the government; for they elected two consuls every year, and created a prefect, who was a kind of tribune of the people. They had a court of twelve senators, who named the principal officers of the duchy of Rome. This municipal government had sometimes more, and at other times less authority. The Popes were possessed rather of a high degree of credit, than of a legislative power.

Though

T
lost
west
judg
judg
whic
suffic
persti
strong
divor
Charl
Ch
marr
the ea
Gontr
bert,
no bo
one as
thing.
of a d
pudiat
and to
action
stances.
by the
his har
ring w
foul pla
if the
must ha
the skin
which is
with the
juice.
have att
is well k
The si
the judg
cleared
and in th
VOL. I

Though they were not sovereigns of Rome, yet they lost no opportunity of acting as sovereigns of the western church. The bishops set themselves up as the judges of kings, and the popes pretended to pronounce judgment on the bishops. This clashing of authority, which prevailed in every court, together with the insufficiency of the laws, this mixture of religion, superstition, weakness and vice, cannot be represented in stronger colours than by a narrative of the marriage and divorce of Lotharius King of Lorrain, nephew of Charles the Bald.

Charlemagne had repudiated one of his wives, and married another, not only with the approbation, but at the earnest request of Pope Stephen. The Frank Kings Gontram, Caribert, Sigebert, Chilperic, and Dagobert, had had several wives at the same time; and yet no body complained: if it was a scandal, it was such a one as created no uneasiness. But time changes every thing. Lotharius, who had married Teutberga, daughter of a duke of Burgundia Transjurana, pretended to repudiate her for being guilty of incest with her brother, and to marry his mistress Valrade. This whole transaction is attended with most extraordinary circumstances. First of all, Queen Teutberga cleared herself by the trial of boiling water. Her advocate plunged his hand into a vessel, and picked up a consecrated ring without being hurt. The king complained of foul play on this occasion. It is beyond all doubt that if the trial was really performed, the queen's advocate must have been acquainted with the secret of preparing the skin to resist the action of boiling water: a secret which is said to consist in rubbing ones self a long time with the spirit of vitriol and alum, together with onion juice. None of the academies of sciences in our days have attempted to verify, by experiments, a truth which is well known among mountebanks.

The success of this trial was reckoned a miracle, and the judgment of God himself: yet Teutberga, though cleared by heaven, acknowledged to several bishops, and in the presence of her father confessor, that she was

guilty of the charge. It is not at all likely, that a king, who wanted to part with his wife upon an accusation of adultery, should think of charging her with committing incest with her brother, unless the fact was notorious. He would hardly go to forge a crime so unnatural, so extraordinary, and so difficult to prove: besides, in those days they must have been utterly insensible of what we call honour. Both the king and queen covered themselves with infamy; the former by his accusation, the latter by her confession. Two national councils were assembled, which permitted the divorce.

Pope Nicholas I. annulled the proceedings of the two councils; and deposed Gontier, archbishop of Cologne, who had been the most active in the affair of the divorce. Gontier immediately writes to all the churches, "Though the lord Nicholas, who is called pope, and looks upon himself as pope and emperor, hath excommunicated us, yet we have withstood his folly:" and afterwards addressing his discourse to the pope himself, "We do not acknowledge, says he, your wicked sentence, we despise it, we even cast you out of our communion, being satisfied with that of our brethren the bishops whom you despise, &c."

A brother of the archbishop of Cologne carried this protest himself to Rome, and laid it sword in hand on the tomb, in which the Romans pretend the remains of St. Peter are deposited. But the political state of affairs having changed soon afterwards, the archbishop changed also. He came to mount Cassino to prostrate himself before pope Adrian I. successor to Nicholas. "I declare, said he, before God, and before his saints, and to you, my lord Adrian, sovereign pontiff, as well as to the bishops subject to your jurisdiction, and to the whole assembly, that I humbly submit to the sentence of deposition canonically denounced against me by pope Nicholas, &c." It is easy to conceive what an accession of strength, an example of this kind must have given to the pretensions of the church of Rome; especially as the conjunctures of the times rendered these examples frequent.

The

wife
his
in t
Cha
decl
the
Italy
the
and
plea
the f
The
and f
Nich
Bald,
churc
Adria
at Ro
with
pope
Lotha
ment,
in obf
crime
at the
The
on thi
which
the civ
been m
the dec
This
riage of
there h
Robert,
municat
for mar
The big
vilege o
always

The same Nicholas I. excommunicated the second wife of Lotharius, and commanded this prince to take his first wife again to his bed. All Europe was involved in the quarrel. The emperor Lewis II. brother to Charles the Bald, and uncle to Lotharius, began with declaiming violently in favour of his nephew against the pope. This emperor, who resided at that time in Italy, threatened Nicholas I. Some blood was spilt on the occasion, and all Italy was alarmed. Negotiations and cabals took place on all sides. Teutberga went to plead her cause at Rome; Valrade, her rival, undertook the same journey, but had not courage enough to finish it. The excommunicated Lotharius likewise went to Rome and submitted to ask pardon of Adrian II. successor to Nicholas I. apprehending lest his uncle Charles the Bald, who was in arms against him in behalf of the church, should seize on his kingdom of Lorrain. Adrian II. upon admitting him to the holy communion at Rome, made him swear that he had not bedded with Valrade, since the orders he had received from pope Nicholas to forbear any further concern with her. Lotharius made oath accordingly, received the sacrament, and died soon afterwards. All historians agree in observing that his death was a punishment for his crime; and that his servants, who forswore themselves at the same time, died within the year.

The right which Nicholas I. and Adrian II. exercised on this occasion, was founded on the *false decretals*, which were already considered as an universal code. As the civil contract which unites the married pair, had been made a sacrament, it was consequently subject to the decision of the church.

This is the first scandalous affair concerning the marriage of crowned heads in the West. Since that time, there have been instances of three kings of France, Robert, Philip I. and Philip Augustus, being excommunicated by the popes for nearly the same cause, or for marriages contracted between very distant relations. The bishops of the kingdom had long claimed the privilege of hearing these causes; but the supreme pontiffs always finally decided them at Rome.

We do not pretend to examine whether these new institutes be useful or dangerous; we do not write either as civilians, or controvertists; but this we can aver, that every country in Christendom hath been disturbed with these scandalous disputes. In this respect the ancient Romans, and the oriental nations, were far more happy. Neither the rights of fathers of families, nor the secrets of marriage beds, were ever exposed to public curiosity. They never heard of any such law-suits about marriage or divorce.

This descendant of Charlemagne was the first that went to plead before a foreign judge, three hundred miles from home, to know which woman he ought to love. The people had like to have been ruined by this dispute. Lewis the Debonnair was the first instance of the power of bishops over the emperors. Lotharius of Lorrain was the first example of the pope's power over the bishops. It plainly appears from the history of those times, that there were hardly any established rules of society among the nations of the West, that the several states had but few laws, and that the church was desirous of assuming a legislative power.

C H A P. XXXI.

Of Photius, and the Schism between the eastern and western Churches.

THE most considerable affair that happened in the church at that time, and which is still to this day of the greatest importance to her, was that which gave rise to the total separation of the Greeks from the Latins. As the patriarchal see of Constantinople was, like the throne, the object of ambition, it was subject to the same revolutions. The emperor Michael III. dissatisfied with Ignatius the patriarch, obliged him to sign his own degradation, and substituted in his place Photius, eunuch of the palace, a person

son o
He w
bisho
pass
he w
sidere
chy;
deaco
arch,
Po
cated
ing p
of a b
brose,
with
to th
the po
then
loudly
of the
broug
sion fr
" one
" the
" To
" wor
" rize
" Gho
" like
" tian
By t
superio
Latins
every t
of cust
tism, e
con, mo
short,
lars, w
even bo

son of noble birth, great genius and universal learning. He was master of the horse and minister of state. The bishops, in order to ordain him patriarch, made him pass in six days through all the degrees. The first day he was made monk, because the monks were considered at that time as constituting a part of the hierarchy; the second he was made lecturer, the third sub-deacon, afterwards deacon priest, and at length patriarch, on Christmas-day, in the year 858.

Pope Nicholas sided with Ignatius, and excommunicated Photius. He reproached him chiefly with having passed so rapidly from the state of a layman to that of a bishop: but Photius justly answered, that St. Ambrose, governor of Milan, and scarce a Christian, had with still greater rapidity joined the episcopal dignity to that of governor; he likewise excommunicated the pope in his turn, and declared him deposed. He then assumed the title of œcumenical patriarch, and loudly accused the western bishops of heresy for being of the pope's communion. The greatest objection he brought against them, was their believing the procession from the Father and the Son. "Men, says he in one of his letters, who have arisen in the darkness of the West, have ruined every thing by their ignorance. To complete their impiety, they have added new words to the sacred symbol which had been authorized by all the councils, by saying that the Holy Ghost does not proceed from the Father only, but likewise from the Son, which is renouncing Christianity."

By this and a great many other passages, we see what superiority the Greeks at that time affected over the Latins. They pretended that Rome was indebted for every thing to the Greek church, even for the names of customs, ceremonies, mysteries and dignities. *Baptism, eucharist, liturgy, diocese, parish, bishop, priest, deacon, monk, ecclesiastic*, are all of Greek derivation. In short, they looked upon the Latins as ignorant scholars, who had rebelled against their masters, without even being acquainted with their language. They accused

cused us of refusing to learn the catechism that we might not be Christians.

The other subjects of anathema were, that the Latins made use of unleavened bread in the eucharist, that they eat eggs and cheese in Lent, and their priests did not shave their beards. Strange reasons these for creating such a breach between the churches of the East and West.

But every impartial judge must acknowledge, that Photius was not only the most learned man in the church, but likewise a very great bishop. He behaved just as St. Ambrose had done, when Basil, the murderer of the emperor Michael, appeared in the church of St. Sophia: *You are unworthy*, said he, with a loud voice, *to approach the sacred mysteries, you whose hands are still imbrued in the blood of your benefactor.* Photius did not find another Theodosius in Basil: this tyrant did an act of justice purely out of revenge; he restored Ignatius to the patriarchal see, and banished Photius. Rome availed herself of this conjuncture to call the eighth œcumenical council at Constantinople, composed of three hundred bishops. The pope's legates presided there, but did not understand a word of Greek, and very few of the other bishops understood Latin. Photius was by the whole assembly condemned as an intruder, and obliged to do public penance. The five patriarchs signed before the pope's legates, which is very extraordinary; for since the legates had the first place, they ought to have signed the first. But during the whole council, none of the questions which divided the East and West were canvassed, their only aim was to depose Photius.

Some time after, upon the death of the legitimate patriarch Ignatius, Photius had the address to prevail upon the emperor Basilus to reinstate him. Pope John VIII. received him into his communion, acknowledged him as patriarch, corresponded with him, and notwithstanding this eighth œcumenical council, which had anathematized the patriarch, the pope sent his legates to another council at Constantinople, in which Photius

was

was declared innocent by four hundred bishops, three hundred of whom had before signed his condemnation. The very legates of this same see of Rome, who had formerly anathematized him, were instrumental in annulling this eighth œcumenical council. How ageable is every thing amongst men! How often is falsity changed into truth, according to circumstances! The legates of John VIII. loudly declared in full council: *Whosoever will not acknowledge Photius, let his portion be with Judas.* The whole council cried out, "Long live the patriarch Photius and the patriarch John."

In short, in the acts of this council, we find a letter from the pope to this learned patriarch, wherein he tells him; *We think as you do. They who have added to the creed, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son, are by us considered as transgressors of the word of God, and we rank them with Judas; but at the same time we are of opinion that they ought to be treated with lenity, and exhorted to renounce this blasphemous doctrine.*

It is therefore evident that the Roman and Greek churches thought differently at that time from what they do at present. Rome afterwards adopted the procession from the Father to the Son; and it happened also in 1274, that the Greek emperor Michael Paleologus, wanting the assistance of a new crusade against the Turks, sent his patriarch and chancellor to the second council at Lyons, where they joined with the council in singing in Latin, *qui ex parte filioque procedit.* But the Greek church returned again to her old opinion, which she seemed once more to abandon, on occasion of the re-union with Eugene IV. which proved but of very short duration. Let mankind learn from hence to bear with one another: here they may see variations and disputes on a fundamental point, which raised no disturbances, filled no prisons, and lighted no faggots.

This condescension of pope John VIII. to the patriarch Photius has been severely censured, but without reflecting that the pontiff at that time stood greatly in need of the emperor Basilus. A king of Bulgaria,
named

named Bogoris, yielding to the solicitations of his wife, who was a Christian, embraced this religion after the example of Clovis and king Egbert. The question was, then to know on which patriarchate this new Christian province should depend; the dispute was between Constantinople and Rome, and the emperor Basilus was to decide. This in some measure explains the condescension which the bishop of Rome shewed to the bishop of Constantinople.

We must not forget to mention, that in this, as well as in the preceding councils, there were *cardinals*: this was a title then given to priests and deacons, who assisted the metropolitans with their advice. There were some of them at Rome as well as in other churches; and though they made a figure even at that time, yet they signed after the bishops and the abbots.

The pope, both in his letters and by his legates, gave the title of *holiness* to the patriarch Photius: the other patriarchs are likewise in this council called *popes*. This is a Greek appellation, which was common at first to all priests, but by degrees it became the distinguishing title of the metropolitan of Rome.

John VIII. seems to have managed his affairs with great prudence: but his successors having quarrelled with the Greek empire, and having adopted the eighth general council of 869, and rejected the other, which had acquitted Photius; the peace established by John VIII. was broken by this step. Photius then exclaimed against the church of Rome, and charged it with heresy in regard to the article *filioque procedit*, to eating eggs in Lent, to using unleavened bread in the sacrament, and several other customs. But the grand point of separation was the supremacy. Photius and his successors wanted to be the first bishops in Christendom; and could not endure that the bishop of Rome, a city which they looked upon at that time as barbarous, separated from the empire by its rebellion, and exposed as a prey to the first invader, should dispute the pre-cedency with the bishop of the imperial city. At that time the patriarch of Constantinople had all the dioceses

of

of Sicily and Apulia under his jurisdiction; while the holy see having fallen under a foreign dominion, had been despoiled of its patrimony in those provinces, and at the same time of its metropolitan rights. The Greek church held that of Rome in contempt. The sciences flourished at Constantinople; but at Rome all learning, and even the Latin tongue, was fallen to decline: and though they knew somewhat more in this capital than in the other parts of the West, still that little knowledge had a tincture of those calamitous times. The Greeks took ample revenge of that superiority which the Latins had had over them, from the time of Lucretius and Cicero down to Cornelius Tacitus. They no longer mentioned the Romans but with a strain of irony. The bishop Luitprandus, who was sent on an embassy to Constantinople by the Othos, takes notice that the Greeks called Gregory the Great by no other name than that of Gregory the Dialogist; because indeed his dialogues shew him to have been a man of too much simplicity. But time has produced a total change. The pope is now a great sovereign; Rome is become the seat of the polite arts, and the Latin church is famed for learning; while the patriarch of Constantinople is no more than a slave, and the bishop of a people who are in slavery.

Photius, whose life was a scene of more adversity than glory, was deposed by court intrigues, and died miserable; yet his successors adhered to his pretensions, and maintained them with vigour.

Pope John VIII. made still a more miserable exit: the annals of Fulda take notice that he was knocked on the head with a hammer. In succeeding times we shall often behold the pontifical see imbrued in blood, and Rome constantly an object of foreign ambition, and as constantly an object of pity.

No dogmatic disputes had as yet disturbed the western church; there is little more than the bare mention made of a trifling theological contest started in 814; by one John Godescaldus, concerning predestination and grace. The event proved how dangerous it is to meddle with

these matters, and especially to dispute against a powerful antagonist. This monk, having taken certain expressions of St. Paul and St. Augustine in a literal sense, preached up the absolute and eternal predestination of a few elect, and a great number of damned. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, a man as violent in church matters as in those of the state, told him that "he was" predestinated to be condemned and whipped;" and accordingly he was excommunicated in one of the lesser councils held in 850, and then stripped naked in the presence of Charles the Bald, and flogged from his shoulders to his legs by monks.

This impertinent dispute, in which both parties were equally in the wrong, has been but too often revived. In Holland you will find the synod of Dordrecht, which consisted of persons who favoured the doctrine of Godescaldus, treating those of Hincmar's sect there worse than with a simple flogging. On the other hand, you will find the Jesuits in France, who were of Hincmar's party, persecuting to the utmost of their power the Jansenists who were attached to the tenets of Godescaldus; and these disputes, which were disgraceful to an enlightened nation, will never be wholly at an end till there are more philosophers than teachers.

I should not take notice of an epidemical folly with which the people of Dijon were seized in 844, on account of a Saint Benignus, who is said to have given convulsions to the people who prayed over his tomb: I should not, I say, take notice of this popular superstition, if it had not been furiously revived in our times under almost the same circumstances. It seems as if a kind of fate had determined, that the same follies should from time to time make their appearance on this great stage of the world: but good sense is also the same in all times; and there has been nothing so judiciously advanced concerning the modern miracles of St. Medard at Paris, as what a bishop of Lyons said, in 844, in regard to those of Dijon: "This is a strange kind of
"faint who maims those who have recourse to him: I
"have always thought that miracles ought to be per-
"formed

“ formed rather for the cure of diseases than for inflicting them.

These trifles did not disturb the peace of the West. Theological disputes were at that time considered as of little consequence; the whole aim of the church was to enlarge her dominions. They made more noise in the East, because the clergy having no temporal power in that part of the world, endeavoured to acquire consequence by their controversies. There is yet another cause to be assigned of the theological tranquillity of the West, namely, the great ignorance of that age, which produced this good however, among an infinite number of evils.

C H A P. XXXII.

State of the Western Empire towards the End of the ninth Century.

THE empire of the West subsisted only in name. Arnould, Arnolfe, or Arnold, a bastard son of Carloman, made himself master of Germany; but Italy was divided between two lords, both of the blood of Charlemagne by the females: one was a duke of Spoleto, named Guy; the other Berenger, duke of Friuli; both invested with these duchies by Charles the Bald, and both pretenders to the empire as well as to the kingdom of France. Arnold, in quality of emperor, looked upon France as belonging to him of right, while this kingdom, severed from the empire, was divided betwixt Charles the Simple, who was losing it, and king Eudes, great uncle of Hugh Capet, who was usurping it.

One Bozo, king of Arles, likewise put in his claim for the empire. Formosus, bishop of the unfortunate city of Rome, had so little weight at that time, that he was obliged to give the sacred unction to the strongest. He crowned this Guy of Spoleto; the following year he crowned Berenger, who happened to be conqueror;

H h 2

and

and at length he was forced to crown this Arnold, who besieged Rome, and took it by storm. The equivocal oath which the Romans took to Arnold, shews that the popes already pretended to the sovereignty of Rome. It was couched in these words: "I swear by
 " the holy mysteries, that save my honour, the laws
 " of my country, and my fidelity to my lord Formosus
 " the pope, I will be faithful to the emperor Arnold."

The popes of those days were in some respects similar to the caliphs of Bagdat, who were revered by all the Mahometan states as the heads of their religion, and yet had no other privilege than that of granting investitures of kingdoms to those who demanded them with sword in hand: but there was this difference between the caliphs and the popes, that the former were fallen from the first throne in the world, while the latter were insensibly rising.

In reality, there was no longer any empire subsisting either in right or in fact. The Romans, who with a general acclamation had submitted themselves to Charlemagne, refused to acknowledge the sovereignty of bastards and strangers, who were hardly masters of a small part of Germany.

The Roman people, notwithstanding their humiliation, and their intermixture with such a number of foreigners, still preserved, as they do to this day, a secret kind of haughtiness, inspired by their former grandeur. They could not bear that the Bruëteri, the Catti, the Marcomanni, should call themselves successors of the Cæsars, and that the banks of the Mein, and the Hercynian forest, should be the center of the empire of Titus and Trajan.

They shuddered with indignation at Rome, and at the same time smiled with contempt upon hearing, that after the death of Arnold, his son Hiludovic, whom the French call Louis, had been created emperor of the Romans at three or four years of age in a barbarous village, named Forcheim, by a few German lords and bishops. This infant was never reckoned in the list of emperors; and yet the Germans looked upon him as

one

one
 Inc
 gov
 the
 nor
 as a
 emp
 F
 of th
 912,
 coun
 princ
 A
 strik
 (who
 as th
 of an
 the i
 of th
 death
 Germ
 duke
 Henr
 elect
 princ
 junct
 inhab
 assem

SU
 i
 The c
 by Ba
 the k

one who was to succeed to Charlemagne and the Cæsars. Indeed this was a strange sort of Roman empire, a government that neither possessed the countries between the Rhine and the Maese, nor France, nor Burgundy, nor Spain, nor any part of Italy, nor even so much as a house in Rome that could be said to belong to the emperor.

From the time of this Louis, the last German prince of the bastard blood of Charlemagne, and who died in 912, Germany was in the same condition as France, a country depopulated by civil and foreign wars, under a prince tumultuously elected and ill obeyed.

All governments are subject to revolutions: it was a striking one to see part of those uncivilized Saxons (who were treated by Charlemagne in the same manner as the Helotes were by the Lacedemonians) at the end of an hundred and twelve years, conferring or assuming the imperial dignity, which was no longer in the family of their conqueror. Otho, duke of Saxony, after the death of Louis, by his credit and interest, put the German crown, as it is said, on the head of Conrad, duke of Franconia; and after the death of Conrad, Henry the Fowler, son of duke Otho of Saxony, was elected emperor. They who were become hereditary princes in Germany, determined these elections in conjunction with the bishops, and sometimes the principal inhabitants of the several cities were convened to these assemblies.

C H A P. XXXIII.

Of Feudal Tenures, and the Empire.

SUPERIOR strength, which disposes of every thing in this world, gave Italy and Gaul to the Romans. The conquests of that people were afterwards usurped by Barbarians. Charlemagne's father usurped Gaul from the kings of the Franks. Under Charlemagne's descendants,

cendants, the governors of provinces usurped all they could. The kings of the Lombards had already established the feudal tenures in Italy: and this was the plan by which the dukes and counts, after the reign of Charles the Bald, were directed. By degrees their governments became hereditary. The bishops of several considerable sees, already powerful by their dignity, had only one step further to take in order to become princes; and this step was soon taken. From thence arises the temporal powers of the bishops of Mentz, Cologne, Triers, Wurtzburg, and of so many others in Germany and France. The archbishops of Rheims, Lyons, Beauvais, Langres and Laon, claimed the prerogatives of royalty. But this power of the dignified clergy did not last long in France; though in Germany it has been for many years confirmed. In short, even the monks themselves became princes; the abbots of Fulda, St. Gal, Kempten, Corbie, &c. became petty kings in a country, where fourscore years before they and their monks manured some lands, which had been bestowed upon them by their charitable proprietors. All these lords, dukes, counts, bishops, abbots, yielded homage to the sovereign. The origin of this feudal government has been long the subject of inquiry: in all probability it is derived from no other source than the ancient custom of all nations, of imposing homage and tribute on the weaker side. It is known that the Roman emperors gave away lands in perpetuity to their veterans on certain conditions; of this we have instances in the lives of Alexander Severus and Probus. The Lombards were the first who erected duchies to be held as fiefs of their kingdom: Spoleto and Benevento under the kings of Lombardy were hereditary dukedoms.

Before Charlemagne's time, Tassillo was possessed of the dukedom of Bavaria on condition of homage; and this dukedom would have descended to posterity, if Charlemagne after subduing that prince, had not dispossessed both the father and his children.

There were at that time no free towns in Germany, and consequently there was neither trade nor opulence.

The

The
with
mid
divi
Com
Hur
been
so g
Aust
just
They
they
plun
coun
In
emer
time.
Mora
the M
were
It v
servin
of Ge
The
the tr
of a
tion.
be wa
is supp
games
short,
seem
Fowler
Mentz
the pe
many,
fight of
But u
the biff
after thi

The cities beyond the Rhine were not even surrounded with walls. This state, which might have been so formidable, was rendered so impotent by the number and division of its several petty princes, that the emperor Conrad was obliged to promise an annual tribute to the Hungarians, Huns or Panonians, a people who had been awed by Charlemagne, and who were afterwards so greatly humbled by the emperors of the house of Austria. But at that period of time they seemed to be just the same nation as they had been under Attila. They ravaged Germany and the frontiers of France; they made incursions into Italy through Tirol, after plundering Bavaria; and then returned to their own country, loaded with the spoils of so many nations.

In the reign of Henry the Fowler, Germany began to emerge from the chaos in which it had remained till that time. Its limits were then the river Oder, Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, the banks of the Rhine, the Scheld, the Moselle, the Maese; and Pomerania and Holstein were its barriers towards the north.

It would seem as if Henry the Fowler was very deserving of the imperial crown. Under him the lords of Germany, who had been so divided, were reunited. The first fruit of this reunion was the abolition of the tribute paid to the Hungarians, in consequence of a signal victory obtained over this formidable nation. He caused most of the cities of Germany to be walled round; and established a militia. He is supposed to have been the inventor of some military games, which gave the first idea of tournaments. In short, Germany began to recover herself, but did not seem to pretend to the Roman empire. Henry the Fowler had been consecrated by the archbishop of Mentz; but no legate from the pope, no deputy from the people of Rome assisted at the ceremony. Germany, during the whole of this reign, seems to have lost sight of Italy.

But under Otho the Great, whom the German princes, the bishops and abbots, unanimously elected emperor after the death of his father, the case was very different.

The

The acknowledged heir of a potent prince, who has been the founder or the restorer of a state, is generally more powerful than his father, unless he is deficient in courage; for he enters upon a career already opened to him, and he begins where his predecessors finished. Thus Alexander went farther than Philip, Charlemagne farther than Pepin, and Otho the Great far surpassed Henry the Fowler.

C H A P. XXXIV.

Of Otho the Great in the tenth Century.

OTHO, who in some degree restored the empire of Charlemagne, extended, as he had done, the Christian religion in Germany by his victories. He compelled the Danes to pay tribute to him, and to submit to baptism, which had been preached to them a century before, but was now almost entirely neglected.

These Danes or Normans, after conquering Neustria and England, and ravaging France and Germany, were obliged to yield to Otho. He appointed bishops in Denmark, who at first were subject to the archbishop of Hamburg, metropolitan of the churches of those barbarians, which had been founded lately in Holstein, Sweden and Denmark: the whole of their Christianity consisted in making the sign of the cross. After an obstinate war he subdued Bohemia: it was after this time that Bohemia and even Denmark, were considered as provinces of the empire; but the Danes soon shook off the yoke.

In this manner Otho rose to be the most powerful sovereign of the West, and the umpire of princes. His authority was so great, and the state of France at that time so deplorable, that Louis, surnamed *d'outremer*, or from *beyond sea*, son of Charles the Simple, and a descendant of Charlemagne, repaired in person, in 948, to a council of bishops held by Otho in the neighbourhood

hood
verec
" I
" the
" Ye
" for
" wh
" ou
" pla
" ge
" ha
" I a
" and
" by
Th
the po
tom o
which
ring
votes
France
Su
he w
themse
could
men,
against
Italy b
Italy
and me
by the
Rome
are acc
the *Lea*
Mad, o
Englan
the ho
form an
tificial
VOL.

hood of Mentz, in 948, where this king of France delivered himself in these very words, as recorded in the acts:
 " I have been acknowledged as king, and crowned, by
 " the votes of all the lords and nobility of France.
 " Yet Hugh has driven me away, after taking me prisoner in a fraudulent manner, and confining me a
 " whole year; nor could I obtain my liberty, without surrendering to him the town of Laon, the only
 " place left to queen Gerberga to keep her court together with my servants. If it is pretended that I
 " have committed any crime deserving such treatment,
 " I am ready to abide by the judgment of the council
 " and the orders of king Otho, or to decide the affair
 " by single combat."

This important speech proves several points, viz. the power of Otho, the weakness of France, the custom of single combats, and in short, the practice which was beginning then to be introduced of conferring the crown not by right of blood, but by the votes of the nobility, a practice soon abolished in France.

Such was the power of Otho the Great, when he was invited to pass the Alps by the Italians themselves: a people ever factious and feeble, who could neither submit to be governed by their countrymen, nor recover their freedom, nor defend themselves against the Saracens and Hungarians, who still infested Italy by their incursions.

Italy, which even in its ruinous state, was the richest and most flourishing country in the West, was weakened by the divisions of petty tyrants; but in those divisions Rome took always the lead of other cities. They who are acquainted with the state of Paris in the time of the *League*, and particularly in the reign of Charles the Mad, or who have read of the distracted condition of England under Charles I. or in the civil wars between the houses of York and Lancaster, may be able to form an idea of Rome in the tenth century. The pontifical chair was oppressed, disgraced and imbrued in
 Vol. I. *Gen. Hist.* I i blood,

blood, and the election of the popes conducted in a manner, of which there are but few instances in history either before or since that period.

C H A P. XXXV.

Of the Popes in the tenth Century, before Otho the Great made himself Master of Rome.

THE disgrace and intestine troubles which afflicted Rome and its church in the tenth century, and which continued for a long time after, neither happened under the Greek or Latin emperors, nor under the Gothic kings, nor under the kings of the Lombards, nor in the reign of Charlemagne. They were evidently the effect of anarchy; and this very anarchy was owing to the measures which the popes had taken to prevent it, by calling the Franks into Italy. If they had really possessed all the lands which Charlemagne is said to have given them, they would have been princes of greater power than they are even at this day. Order and regularity would have prevailed at their elections, and in their government, as it does at present. But all their views were contested; Italy was at all times the object of foreign ambition, and the fate of Rome was always uncertain. We must never forget, that the grand design of the Romans was to restore the ancient republic; that petty tyrants had started up in Italy and in Rome; that the elections of the bishops were scarce ever free; and that every thing was influenced by faction.

Formosus, son of the priest Leo, at the time he was bishop of Porto, had headed a faction against John VIII. and was twice excommunicated by that pope; but these excommunications which soon became so terrible to crowned heads, were so little regarded by Formosus, that in 890 he procured himself to be elected pope.

Stephen

lik
tici
mo
to l
fum
to p
dea
ing
guil
the
men
body
his t
the T
Po
horri
mosu
irons
Th
Steph
again
pontif
Th
people
intrig
his ri
ackno
John
During
whom
canella
for the
Sergius
Theodo
son by
palace:
the Ro
ple, we
example

Stephen VI. or VII. who succeeded Formosus and was likewise the son of a priest, united the spirit of fanaticism to that of faction: having all his life hated Formosus, he ordered his body which had been embalmed, to be dug up, and dressing him in his pontifical habit, summoned him before a council that had been called to pass sentence on the memory of the deceased. The dead pope had counsel allowed him, and his trial having been carried on in form, the corpse was found guilty of having changed sees, and of having quitted the bishopric of Porto for that of Rome: in punishment of this crime, the head was separated from the body by the hands of the public executioner, three of his fingers were cut off, and the body was thrown into the Tiber.

Pope Stephen VI. rendered himself so odious by this horrid and ridiculous farce, that the friends of Formosus having stirred up the citizens, loaded him with irons and afterwards strangled him in prison.

The party who had behaved in this manner to Stephen, caused the body of Formosus to be fished up again, and to be interred a second time with all the pontifical ceremonies.

This dispute served to inflame the minds of the people. Sergius III. who had filled all Rome with his intrigues to get himself elected pope, was banished by his rival John IX. a friend of Formosus; but being acknowledged supreme pontiff after the death of John IX. he condemned Formosus a second time. During these troubles Theodora, mother of Marozia, whom she afterwards married to the marquis of Toscanella, and of another Theodora, all three famous for their amours, bore the principal sway at Rome. Sergius owed his election intirely to the intrigues of Theodora the mother. While he was pope, he had a son by Marozia, whom he publicly educated in his palace: but he does not appear to have been hated by the Romans, who being naturally a voluptuous people, were more ready to follow than to censure his example.

After his decease, in 912, the two sisters Marozia and Theodora, procured the chair of Rome for one of their favourites, named Lando; but this Lando dying, the young Theodora made interest for her lover John X. who had been bishop of Bologna, and afterwards of Ravenna, and caused him to be elected pope. He was not reproached, as Formosus had been, with changing his see. These popes, though condemned by posterity as wicked bishops, were not bad princes. Far from it; this John X. who owed his election to a love intrigue, was a man of genius and courage; he did more than all his predecessors were able to compass, by driving the Saracens out of that part of Italy called Garillan.

In order to succeed in this expedition, he had the policy to prevail on the emperor of Constantinople to lend him troops, though this emperor had as much reason to complain of the rebellious Romans as of the Saracens. He made the count of Capua arm his vassals, and got the militia of Tuscany to join him; he then put himself at the head of this army, taking with him a young son of Marozia and of the marquis Adalbert. After having driven the Mahometans from the neighbourhood of Rome, he wanted also to deliver Italy from the Germans and other foreigners.

Italy was invaded almost at the same time by the Berengers, by a king of Burgundy, and by a king of Arles: but he hindered them all from having any command in Rome. At the end of a few years however, Guido, brother by the mother's side to Hugh king of Arles, the tyrant of Italy, having espoused Marozia, who was all powerful at Rome; this very Marozia conspired against the pope, who had been for so long a time her sister's gallant: upon which he was seized, imprisoned, and smothered between two mattresses.

In 929, Marozia, now mistress of Rome, caused a person named Leo to be elected pope, whom she murdered in prison at the end of a few months. Having afterwards given the see of Rome to an obscure person, who enjoyed

enjoyed it but two years; she at length procured the pontifical dignity for her son John XI. who was the fruit of her adulterous commerce with Sergius III.

In 931, John XI. was only twenty-four years of age when his mother made him pope; she invested him with this dignity merely on condition that he should confine himself entirely to his episcopal functions, and act in the capacity of his mother's chaplain.

We are told that Marozia poisoned at that time her husband Guido marquis of Toscanella. It is certain, that she married her husband's brother Hugh, king of Lombardy, and put him in possession of Rome, flattering herself, that in conjunction with him she should enjoy the imperial dignity. But a son of Marozia, by a former marriage, sided with the Romans against his own mother, and putting himself at their head, drove Hugh out of Rome, and confined Marozia and the pope her son in Adrian's fortress, now called the castle of St. Angelo. It is pretended that John XI. was poisoned in his imprisonment.

One Stephen VIII. a German by birth, was chosen in 939; but on account of his country he proved so odious to the Romans, that an insurrection took place, in which the people flashed his face in such a manner, that he never afterwards could appear in public.

Sometime after this, in 956, a grandson of Marozia, named Octavianus Sporco, was by the interest of his family elected pope at the age of eighteen. He took the name of John XII. out of regard to the memory of his uncle John XI. and is the first pope that changed his name on his accession to the pontificate. He was not in orders when his family made him pope. This John was a Roman patrician; so that being invested with the same dignity as Charlemagne, he united both powers by the pontifical see, and thus acquired the most legitimate right. But he was young, addicted to debauchery, and by no means a powerful prince.

It seems wonderful, that under so many scandalous and insignificant popes, the see of Rome did not lose either its prerogatives or pretensions; but the reason is, almost

After his decease, in 912, the two sisters Marozia and Theodora, procured the chair of Rome for one of their favourites, named Lando; but this Lando dying, the young Theodora made interest for her lover John X. who had been bishop of Bologna, and afterwards of Ravenna, and caused him to be elected pope. He was not reproached, as Formosus had been, with changing his see. These popes, though condemned by posterity as wicked bishops, were not bad princes. Far from it; this John X. who owed his election to a love intrigue, was a man of genius and courage; he did more than all his predecessors were able to compass, by driving the Saracens out of that part of Italy called Garillan.

In order to succeed in this expedition, he had the policy to prevail on the emperor of Constantinople to lend him troops, though this emperor had as much reason to complain of the rebellious Romans as of the Saracens. He made the count of Capua arm his vassals, and got the militia of Tuscany to join him; he then put himself at the head of this army, taking with him a young son of Marozia and of the marquis Adalbert. After having driven the Mahometans from the neighbourhood of Rome, he wanted also to deliver Italy from the Germans and other foreigners.

Italy was invaded almost at the same time by the Berengers, by a king of Burgundy, and by a king of Arles: but he hindered them all from having any command in Rome. At the end of a few years however, Guido, brother by the mother's side to Hugh king of Arles, the tyrant of Italy, having espoused Marozia, who was all powerful at Rome; this very Marozia conspired against the pope, who had been for so long a time her sister's gallant: upon which he was seized, imprisoned, and smothered between two mattresses.

In 929, Marozia, now mistress of Rome, caused a person named Leo to be elected pope, whom she murdered in prison at the end of a few months. Having afterwards given the see of Rome to an obscure person, who

enjoyed

enjoyed it but two years; she at length procured the pontifical dignity for her son John XI. who was the fruit of her adulterous commerce with Sergius III.

In 931, John XI. was only twenty-four years of age when his mother made him pope; she invested him with this dignity merely on condition that he should confine himself entirely to his episcopal functions, and act in the capacity of his mother's chaplain.

We are told that Marozia poisoned at that time her husband Guido marquis of Toscanella. It is certain, that she married her husband's brother Hugh, king of Lombardy, and put him in possession of Rome, flattering herself, that in conjunction with him she should enjoy the imperial dignity. But a son of Marozia, by a former marriage, sided with the Romans against his own mother, and putting himself at their head, drove Hugh out of Rome, and confined Marozia and the pope her son in Adrian's fortress, now called the castle of St. Angelo. It is pretended that John XI. was poisoned in his imprisonment.

One Stephen VIII. a German by birth, was chosen in 939; but on account of his country he proved so odious to the Romans, that an insurrection took place, in which the people slashed his face in such a manner, that he never afterwards could appear in public.

Sometime after this, in 956, a grandson of Marozia, named Octavianus Sporco, was by the interest of his family elected pope at the age of eighteen. He took the name of John XII. out of regard to the memory of his uncle John XI. and is the first pope that changed his name on his accession to the pontificate. He was not in orders when his family made him pope. This John was a Roman patrician; so that being invested with the same dignity as Charlemagne, he united both powers by the pontifical see, and thus acquired the most legitimate right. But he was young, addicted to debauchery, and by no means a powerful prince.

It seems wonderful, that under so many scandalous and insignificant popes, the see of Rome did not lose either its prerogatives or pretensions; but the reason is, almost

almost every other see was governed at that time in the same manner. The clergy of Italy might despise such popes, but they respected the papacy, especially as they aspired to that station themselves; in short, in the public opinion the dignity was sacred, even when the person who enjoyed it was odious.

While Rome and the church were thus rent in pieces, Berenger, surnamed the Young, disputed the government of Italy with Hugh of Arles. The Italians, as Luitprandus, a cotemporary writer expresses himself, always wanted two masters, in order to be really subject to none; a false and unhappy policy, which produced only new tyrants and fresh calamities. Such was the deplorable state of this fine country, when Otho the Great was invited thither by the solicitations and complaints of almost all the cities in Italy, and even by this young Pope John XII. who was reduced to the necessity of calling in the Germans, a people whom he heartily detested.

C H A P. XXXVI.

Continuation of the Reign of Otho, and of the State of Italy.

OTHO came into Italy in 961, and acted there as Charlemagne had done. In 962 he subdued Berenger, who pretended to the sovereignty of that country; caused himself to be consecrated and crowned emperor of the Romans by the hands of the pope, assumed the titles of Cæsar and Augustus, and obliged the pope to swear allegiance to him upon the tomb where St. Peter's body is said to lie interred. An authentic instrument of this solemn act was drawn up, and the clergy and nobility of Rome bound themselves never to chuse a pope, except in the presence of the emperor's commissioners. In this act Otho confirms the donations of Pepin, Charlemagne, and Louis the Debonnair, but without specifying those disputed donations: "Save in every thing," says he, our own power, and that of our son and his "descendants."

“descendants.” This instrument, written in golden letters, and signed by seven German bishops, five counts, two abbots, and several Italian prelates, is still preserved in the castle of St. Angelo, according to Baronius, and is dated the 13th of February 962.

But how could the emperor Otho, by an act confirming one made by Charlemagne, bestow the city of Rome itself which Charlemagne himself never bestowed? How could he give away the dutchy of Benevento, which he did not possess, and which at that time belonged to its own duke? How could he make a present of Corsica and Sicily, when those islands were occupied by the Saracens? It is certain that either Otho was deceived, or this pretended act is spurious.

It is affirmed by some, and among the rest by Mezeray, that Lotharius, king of France, and Hugh Capet, afterwards king, assisted at this coronation. The kings of France were indeed so weak at that time, that they might serve as an ornament to the coronation of an emperor; but neither Lotharius nor Hugh Capet's names are to be met with among those who signed the instrument.

The pope having thus given himself a master, when he only wanted a protector, was not long faithful to his engagement. He entered into a confederacy against the emperor with that very Berenger who had taken refuge among the Mahometans lately settled on the coasts of Provence. He invited Berenger's son to Rome, while Otho was at Pavia; he sent likewise to the Hungarians, soliciting them to make an incursion into Germany; but he was not strong enough to support this bold step, and the emperor had power sufficient to punish him.

Otho therefore returned from Pavia to Rome, and having secured the city, he held a council, in which he proceeded in form against the pope. He assembled the German and Roman lords, forty bishops, and seventeen cardinals, in the church of St. Peter; and there, in the presence of the whole people, the holy father was accused of having lain with several women, and especially

especially one Etiennette, who had been his father's concubine, and who died in child-bed. The other heads of accusation were, that he had ordained a child of ten years bishop of Todi; that he had made a sale of ordinations and benefices; that he had plucked out his godfather's eyes; that he had castrated a cardinal, and afterwards put him to death; in fine, that he did not believe in Jesus Christ, and had invoked the devil: two things which would seem to contradict each other. Thus, as it generally happens, they mixed false and true accusations together; but they did not mention a word of the only motive for which this council was assembled. The emperor, without doubt, was fearful of reviving that revolt and conspiracy in which even the pope's accusers had been concerned. This young pontiff, who was then twenty-seven years of age, seemed to have been deposed for his incestuous and scandalous life; but the real cause of his degradation was the strong desire he and all the Romans had of abolishing the German power in Rome.

Otho could not seize on the pope's person, or if he could, he committed a great mistake in permitting him to enjoy his liberty. For scarce had he caused Leo VIII. to be elected bishop of Rome, who, if we may venture to credit Arnold, bishop of Orleans, was neither an ecclesiastic, nor even a Christian; scarce had he received homage from this Leo, and quitted Rome, where he ought rather to have resided, when John XII. had the courage to stir up the Romans to revolt, and opposing council to council, deposed Leo VIII. It was ordained, *that no inferior could ever degrade his superior.*

The pope, by this decision, not only meant that the bishops and cardinals should never depose the supreme pontiff; but he aimed also at the emperor, whom the bishops of Rome had always considered as a layman, of whom the church had a right to demand that homage and fealty which he required of her. The cardinal, named John, who had written and read the accusations against the pope, had his right hand cut off. They
plucked

plu
fing
dep
A
fact
stan
plor
to f
regu
know
the a
If
time,
pocri
Th
whole
the co
revolt
the o
carrie
dered
ried w
revenge
in eigh
the rel
ceive t
This
Roman
after hi
render
queror
German
Leo,
senate;
Rome,
Lateran
successor
pope's e
After so
Vol.

plucked out the tongue, and cut off the nose and two fingers of the person who had acted as secretary to the deposing council.

And yet in all these councils, in which the spirit of faction and revenge so invariably presided, they constantly quoted the gospels and the fathers, they implored the light of the Divine Spirit, they pretended to speak in his name, and even established some useful regulations: and whoever was to read these acts, without knowing their history, would imagine he was reading the acts of saints.

If Jesus Christ had returned into the world at that time, what would he have said on seeing so much hypocrisy, and so many abominations in his church?

The emperor was at no great distance during the whole of these transactions; and who knows how far the courage and resentment of the young pontiff, the revolt of the Romans in his favour, and the aversion of the other towns in Italy to the Germans, might have carried this revolution? But Pope John XII. was murdered within three months after, in the arms of a married woman, by the hands of the husband, who thus revenged the injury done him. He died of his wounds in eight days, and we are told, that not believing in the religion of which he was pontiff, he refused to receive the sacrament at his death.

This pope, or rather patrician, had inspired the Romans with such courage, that they ventured, even after his decease, to maintain a siege, and not to surrender but at the last extremity. Otho, twice conqueror of Rome, was master of Italy as well as of Germany.

Leo, whom he had created pope, together with the senate, the heads of the people, and the clergy of Rome, solemnly assembled in the church of St. John Lateran, confirmed the emperor's right of choosing a successor to the kingdom of Italy, of ratifying the pope's election, and of giving investiture to bishops. After so many treaties and oaths, the effects of fear,

the emperors ought to have remained at Rome to see them observed.

The emperor Otho was no sooner returned to Germany, than the Romans again aimed at regaining their freedom. They sent their new pope, who was one of the emperor's creatures to prison; and the prefect of Rome, the tribunes and senate, resolved to revive the ancient laws: but what at one time is an heroic enterprise, is considered at another time as a seditious revolt. Otho flew back to Italy, caused a part of the senate to be hanged, and the prefect of Rome, who had resolved to be another Brutus, to be publicly whipped, led about naked upon an ass, and thrown into a dungeon, where he died of hunger.

C H A P. XXXVII.

Of the Emperors Otho II. and III. and of Rome.

SUCH was nearly the state of Rome under Otho the Great, Otho II. and Otho III. The Germans held the Romans in subjection, and the Romans broke their chains as often as they were able.

A pope elected by the emperor's order, or by his nomination, was sure to be detested by the Romans. The idea of restoring the commonwealth still animated their breasts; yet this noble ambition was productive only of humiliating scenes of misery and horror.

Otho II. marched to Rome as his father had done.—What a government! what an empire! what a pontificate! A consul, named Crescentius, son of Pope John X. and of the famous Marozia, receiving with his title a hatred to royalty, armed Rome against Otho II. He caused Benedict VI. a creature of the emperor's, to be put to death in prison; and the authority of Otho, though he himself was at a distance, having, amidst these troubles, given the Roman chair to the chancellor of the empire in Italy, who was made pope under the

the name of John XIV. this unhappy prelate was a new victim sacrificed by the Roman party. Pope Boniface VI. a creature of the consul Crescentius, already stained with the blood of Benedict VI. destroyed John XIV. The times of Caligula, Nero, and Vitellius, did not produce more deplorable disasters, nor greater instances of barbarity: but the horrid actions and the misfortunes of those popes are as obscure as themselves. These bloody tragedies were indeed acted on the Roman stage; but it was when Rome was small and in ruins; those of the Cæsars had for their theatre all the known world.

Otho II. however, arrived at Rome in 981. The popes had heretofore invited the Franks into Italy, and shaken off the yoke of the eastern emperors. What measures did they take now? They endeavoured to return in appearance to their old masters, and having imprudently called in the Saxon emperors, they wanted to drive them out again. This very Boniface VII. went to Constantinople, to solicit the emperors Basil and Constantine to re-establish the throne of the Cæsars. Rome neither knew what she was, nor to whom she belonged. The consul Crescentius and the senate were desirous of restoring the republic: the pope would have neither a republic nor a master. Otho II. wanted to reign; he therefore entered Rome, and having invited the principal senators, and the consul's adherents to dinner, he caused them all to be murdered, if we can believe Geoffry of Viterbo, in the midst of the entertainment. Thus the pope, by means of his very enemy, got rid of his republican senators; but now he had to rid himself also of the tyrant. It was not enough for him to have called the Greek emperor's troops into Apulia; he likewise invited the Saracens. If the massacre of the senators at this bloody entertainment, as mentioned by Geoffry, be true, it was doubtless far better to have the Mahometans for his protectors, than this bloody Saxon for his master. Otho was defeated by the Greeks and likewise by the Saracens; the latter took him prisoner, but he made his escape,

and taking advantage of the divisions of his enemies, he returned to Rome, where he died in 983.

After his decease the consul Crescentius for some time maintained the shadow of the Roman republic. He drove Gregory IV. nephew to the emperor Otho III. from the pontifical chair: but at length Rome was besieged and taken; Crescentius having been drawn out of the castle of St. Angelo by the hope of an accommodation, and his reliance on the oaths of the emperor, had his head cut off, and his body hung up by the feet; while the new pope, elected by the Romans, under the name of John XV. had his eyes put out, his nose cut off, and in this condition was thrown from the top of the castle of St. Angelo.

The Romans then renewed to Otho III. the allegiance they had sworn to Otho I. and Charlemagne, and he assigned the lands belonging to the marquise of Ancona to the popes to support their dignity.

After the three Othos, this struggle between the German sovereignty, and the liberty of Italy, remained for a long time on the same terms. Under the emperors Henry II. of Bavaria, and Conrad II. surnamed the Salic, as soon as the emperor was employed in Germany, there arose a party in Italy. Henry II. went thither as the Othos had done, to disperse factions, to confirm to the popes the donations of the emperors, and to receive the same homage. In the mean time, the popedom was put up to sale, as well as almost all the other bishoprics.

Benedict VIII. and John XIX. bought it publicly one after the other: they were brothers of the family of the marquis of Toscanella, which had been very powerful at Rome ever since the time of Marozia and Theodora.

After their death, in order to perpetuate the pontificate in their house, the votes were purchased for a child of twelve years of age. This was Benedict IX. who had the bishopric of Rome in the same manner that we still see many families purchase, though privately, benefices for their children.

This

TH
Bene
dint
other
preve
divide
and t
Thi
than t
none l
the de
as you
other
enjoy
by the
pence,
volst,
This
and ha
enjoye
peror
to Rom
Nev
He dep
mans,
Bamber
daring
After
popes
German
was Da
Rome,
above-
getting
sold it.
This
ing inst
cousin E
lated fro
his abs

This disorder had no bounds. In the popedom of Benedict IX. two other popes, who were elected by dint of money, reciprocally excommunicated each other; but by an happy reconciliation a civil war was prevented, and the three popes mutually agreed to divide the revenues of the church among themselves, and to live in peace each with his mistress.

This pacific and singular triumvirate lasted no longer than they had money; and at length, when they had none left, each sold his part of the papacy to Gratian, the deacon, a man of quality, who was very rich: but as young Benedict IX. had been elected long before the other two, they left him, by a solemn agreement, the enjoyment of the tribute which was at that time paid by the English to the see of Rome, called *St. Peter's pence*, which a Danish king of England, named Etelvolft, Edelvolf, or Ethelwulph had submitted to in 852.

This Gratian, who took the name of Gregory VI. and had the reputation of behaving with great wisdom, enjoyed the pontificate very peaceably till the emperor Henry III. the son of Conrad the Salic, went to Rome.

Never did any emperor exercise more authority. He deposed Gregory VI. who was beloved by the Romans, and nominated in his room Suiger bishop of Bamberg, who was his chancellor, without any one's daring to murmur at it.

After the death of this German, who in the list of popes is called Clement II. the emperor who was in Germany, created Poppo, a Bavarian, his successor; this was Damasus II. who went with the emperor's brief to Rome, where he was acknowledged pope in spite of the above-mentioned Benedict IX. who was desirous of getting again into the pontifical chair, after having sold it.

This Bavarian dying twenty-three days after his being installed, the emperor gave the popedom to his cousin Bruno, of the house of Lorrain, whom he translated from the bishopric of Toul to that of Rome, by his absolute authority. Had this authority of the
emperors

emperors continued, the popes would have been no more than their chaplains, and Italy would have been enslaved.

This pontiff took the name of Leo IX. and is placed in the catalogue of saints. We shall find him at the head of an army, fighting against the Norman princes who founded the kingdom of Naples, and at length taken prisoner by them.

If the emperors could have fixed their residence at Rome, it is evident, by the weakness of the Romans, by the divisions of Italy, and by the power of Germany, that they would always have been masters of the popes, and that of course there would have been really a Roman empire. But those elective kings of Germany could not reside at Rome so far distant from the German princes, who were grown too formidable to their masters. The neighbouring nations embraced every opportunity to invade their frontiers. Sometimes they had to oppose the Danes, and at other times the Poles and Hungarians. By this counterpoise Italy was for a time preserved from a yoke which she would otherwise have opposed to no purpose.

Never was Rome and the Latin church held in a more contemptible light at Constantinople than in those unhappy times. Luitprandus, ambassador from Otho I. to the emperor Nicephorus Phocas, tells us, that the inhabitants of Rome were not called Romans, but Lombards, in the imperial city, and that the bishops of Rome were considered only as a schismatic banditti. The supposed residence of St. Peter at Rome was treated as an absurd fable, founded wholly on one of that apostles expressions in his Epistles, where he says, he was then at Babylon, which had been interpreted to mean Rome. The Saxon emperors were also held in as low esteem at Constantinople, being considered as barbarians.

The court of Constantinople however, was by no means superior to that of the German emperor. But in the Greek empire there was more trade, industry and riches than in the Latin: every thing had fallen to decay

cay in
days
archy
ignora
more
has ha
Acade
meet v
chance
soon r

W
Italy w
entirel

This
the Sch
from
were a
torians
beyond
does n
vinces
were fu
they fo

Fran
were i
the kin
Louis,
no othe
some to
age pai
fal, wh
had eit

cay in the western parts of Europe since the glorious days of Charlemagne. Ferocity and debauchery; anarchy and poverty prevailed in every state. Never was ignorance more universal. And yet there were not more miracles then than in other times. Every age has had them, and it is only since the establishment of Academies of Sciences in Europe, that we no longer meet with them amongst enlightened nations; or if by chance they do now and then happen, sound philosophy soon reduces them to their real value.

C H A P. XXXVIII.

Of France towards the Reign of Hugh Capet.

WHILE Germany was thus beginning to assume a new form of administration, and Rome and Italy were without any, France became, like Germany, entirely a feudal government.

This kingdom extended from the neighbourhood of the Scheld and the Maese, to the English channel; and from the Pyrenean mountains to the Rhone. These were at that time its bounds: for though so many historians pretend that this great fief of France extended beyond the Pyrenean mountains, even to the Ebro, it does not at all appear, that the Spaniards in those provinces between the Ebro and the Pyrenean mountains, were subject to the feeble government of France, when they fought against the Mahometans.

France, in which neither Dauphiné nor Provence were included, was a pretty extensive kingdom; but the king of France was far from being a great sovereign. Louis, the last of the descendants of Charlemagne, had no other demesnes than the cities of Laon, Soissons, and some territories that were disputed with him. The homage paid by Normandy, only served to give the king a vassal, who was able to subdue his master. Every province had either its counts or its hereditary dukes: he who
could

emperors continued, the popes would have been no more than their chaplains, and Italy would have been enslaved.

This pontiff took the name of Leo IX. and is placed in the catalogue of saints. We shall find him at the head of an army, fighting against the Norman princes who founded the kingdom of Naples, and at length taken prisoner by them.

If the emperors could have fixed their residence at Rome, it is evident, by the weakness of the Romans, by the divisions of Italy, and by the power of Germany, that they would always have been masters of the popes, and that of course there would have been really a Roman empire. But those elective kings of Germany could not reside at Rome so far distant from the German princes, who were grown too formidable to their masters. The neighbouring nations embraced every opportunity to invade their frontiers. Sometimes they had to oppose the Danes, and at other times the Poles and Hungarians. By this counterpoise Italy was for a time preserved from a yoke which she would otherwise have opposed to no purpose.

Never was Rome and the Latin church held in a more contemptible light at Constantinople than in those unhappy times. Luitprandus, ambassador from Otho I. to the emperor Nicephorus Phocas, tells us, that the inhabitants of Rome were not called Romans, but Lombards, in the imperial city, and that the bishops of Rome were considered only as a schismatic banditti. The supposed residence of St. Peter at Rome was treated as an absurd fable, founded wholly on one of that apostles expressions in his Epistles, where he says, he was then at Babylon, which had been interpreted to mean Rome. The Saxon emperors were also held in as low esteem at Constantinople, being considered as barbarians.

The court of Constantinople however, was by no means superior to that of the German emperor. But in the Greek empire there was more trade, industry and riches than in the Latin: every thing had fallen to decay

cay in
days
archy
ignora
more
has ha
Acade
meet v
chance
soon r

W
Italy w
entirely

This
the Sch
from t
were a
torians
beyond
does no
vinces
were fu
they fo

Fran
were in
the kin
Louis,
no othe
some te
age paid
sal, who
had eith

cay in the western parts of Europe since the glorious days of Charlemagne. Ferocity and debauchery; anarchy and poverty prevailed in every state. Never was ignorance more universal. And yet there were not more miracles then than in other times. Every age has had them, and it is only since the establishment of Academies of Sciences in Europe, that we no longer meet with them amongst enlightened nations; or if by chance they do now and then happen, sound philosophy soon reduces them to their real value.

C H A P. XXXVIII.

Of France towards the Reign of Hugh Capet.

WHILE Germany was thus beginning to assume a new form of administration, and Rome and Italy were without any, France became, like Germany, entirely a feudal government.

This kingdom extended from the neighbourhood of the Scheld and the Maese, to the English channel; and from the Pyrenean mountains to the Rhone. These were at that time its bounds: for though so many historians pretend that this great fief of France extended beyond the Pyrenean mountains, even to the Ebro, it does not at all appear, that the Spaniards in those provinces between the Ebro and the Pyrenean mountains, were subject to the feeble government of France, when they fought against the Mahometans.

France, in which neither Dauphiné nor Provence were included, was a pretty extensive kingdom; but the king of France was far from being a great sovereign. Louis, the last of the descendants of Charlemagne, had no other demesnes than the cities of Laon, Soissons, and some territories that were disputed with him. The homage paid by Normandy, only served to give the king a vassal, who was able to subdue his master. Every province had either its counts or its hereditary dukes: he who could

could only seize two or three villages, paid homage to the usurper of a province; and he who had only a castle paid tribute to him who had taken possession of a city. All this produced a monstrous assemblage of members, without constituting one body.

Time and necessity established it as a custom, that the lords of great fiefs should march with their troops to the assistance of the king. One lord owed him forty days service, another twenty-five, and the rear-vassals marched at the orders of their immediate lords. But while these lords served the state for a few days, they made war against one another almost all the year round. It was to no purpose that the councils, which in those times of criminality frequently enacted good laws, decreed that nobody should fight from Thursday till Monday at break of day, nor in the time of Lent or other solemnities; these regulations not being supported by any coercive power, were without effect. Each castle was the capital of a small district of robbers, and each monastery was in arms, their advocates who were stiled *Avoyers*, and who had been instituted in the early ages to present their petitions to the prince and manage their affairs, were the generals of their troops: their corn was either burnt, or cut down before it was ripe, or defended sword in hand; thus the cities were almost reduced to solitude, and the country depopulated by long famines.

One would have supposed, that this kingdom, without a chief, without government, and without order, must have fallen a prey to a foreign power: but an anarchy nearly of the same nature in all the kingdoms of Europe, constituted its safety; and when under the Othos, Germany became more formidable, it was engaged in intestine wars.

It is from those barbarous times we derive the custom of paying homage for a house and a hamlet to the lord of another village. A lawyer, or a merchant, who possesses an ancient fief, receives fealty and homage from another burgher, or from a peer of the realm, who has bought a mesne tenure in his manor. The laws

laws
den
duti
this
was
W
unde
the a
the i
der
valry
d'arm
beca
not a
TH
pear
they
confi
vassal
point
the cu
armor
on fo
were
magn
sand v
Th
war:
made
they c
The r
buckle
The
and de
batant
than t
covere

* Th
VOL. I.

laws of fiefs no longer subsist; but these old dependences of one fee upon another, these homages and duties still subsist: in almost all our courts of justice this maxim is admitted, *No land without a lord*; as if it was not enough to belong to our country.

When France, Italy and Germany were thus divided under the dominion of a multitude of little tyrants, the armies, the principal strength of which had been the infantry in the time of Charlemagne as well as under the Romans, were now composed wholly of cavalry. They knew no other troops besides the *gens d'armes*, or *men in armour*, a name not given to the foot, because in comparison of the horsemen they were not armed.

The proprietors of the smallest manors did not appear in the field, without bringing as many horse as they could possibly raise; and their ostentation then consisted in being attended by squires, who were called *vassets*, from the word *vassalet*, a little vassal. The point of honour being then to fight only on horseback, the custom obtained of wearing a complete suit of iron armour, which would have been insupportable to a man on foot by its weight: and the *brassets* * and *cuisse*s were a part of the dress. It is pretended that Charlemagne had them, but it was about the year one thousand when they were brought into common use.

They who were rich became almost invulnerable in war: and it was then more than at any other time they made use of clubs to knock down those knights, whom they could not wound with the points of their lances. The most considerable articles of trade were cuirasses, bucklers, and helmets adorned with plumes of feathers.

The peasants whom they dragged to war, defenceless and despised, served for pioneers rather than for combatants. The horses, who were held in greater esteem than the common people, were barbed, and their heads covered with armour.

* The *brassets* were for the arms and the *cuisse*s for the thighs.

There were then scarcely any other laws besides those made by the most powerful for the service of the fiefs. All the other points of distributive justice were left to the caprice of the stewards, and of the provosts and bailiffs nominated by the possessors of lands.

The senates of those cities, which under Charlemagne and the Romans had enjoyed a municipal government, were almost every where abolished. The title *senior*, *seigneur*, or lord, which for a long time had been affected by the chief of these senators, was no longer given to any but the possessors of fiefs.

The term *peer* began to be introduced into the Gallo-German language, which was then used in France. It came from the Latin word *par*, *equal* or *fellow*, and it was only made use of in this sense in the first and second race of the kings of France. The sons of Louis the Debonnair called themselves *parés*, in one of their interviews in the year 851; and long before this, Dagobert had given the name of *peers* to monks. The learned Du Cange observes that Godegrand, bishop of Metz, in the time of Charlemagne gave this title of *peers* to the bishops and abbots. The vassals of the same lord then accustomed themselves to call each other *peers*.

Alfred the Great had established juries in England; these were peers in each profession, and a man on his trial might chuse twelve men of his own profession to be his judges. Some vassals in France had also the same privilege, but the number was not always limited to twelve. There were in each fief as many as there were barons, who held of the same lord, and who were peers amongst themselves, but not peers with their feudal lord.

The princes who paid immediate homage to the crown, such as the dukes of Guienne, Normandy and Burgundy, with the counts of Flanders and Toulouse, were therefore in reality peers of France.

Hugh Capet was not the least powerful: he had possessed for a long time the duchy of France, which extended even to Touraine: he was count of Paris; and his vast demesnes in Picardy and Champagne gave him

him
ther
His
Odo
Sim
acco
Tou
shak
that
reign
if w
royal
conti
succe
It
and
Char
suffra
respec
is at
Franc
him o
which
prude
WH
blood
life by
Capet
recour
perfed
succe
of this
was w
bishop
vester
Char
compo
rival m
being b
tedly f

him also great authority in those provinces. His brother had what at present is the dutchy of Burgundy. His grandfather Robert, and his great uncle Eudes, or Odo, both wore the crown in the time of Charles the Simple. Hugh, his father, surnamed the Abbot, on account of the abbeys of St. Denis, St. Martin de Tours, St. Germain-des-près, and many others, had shaken and governed France: it may therefore be said, that from the year 888, in which king Eudes began his reign, his family governed without interruption; and if we except Hugh the abbot, who would not take the royal crown, it forms a series of sovereigns that has continued more than eight hundred and fifty years; a succession which no other kingdom can produce.

It is well known how Hugh Capet, duke of France and count of Paris, usurped the crown from duke Charles, uncle to the last king, Louis V. If the suffrages had been free, the blood of Charlemagne respected, and the right of succession as sacred as it is at present, Charles would have been king of France: it was not a national parliament that deprived him of the rights enjoyed by his ancestors; but that which makes and unmakes kings, force assisted by prudence.

While Louis, the last king of the Carlovingian blood, was drawing towards the close of his obscure life by a slow decay at the age of twenty-three, Hugh Capet, assembled his forces; and far was he from having recourse to the authority of a parliament, that he dispersed one that was held at Compiègne, to secure the succession to Charles. We have an authentic testimony of this in a letter published by Duchesne, and which was written by Gerbert, who was afterwards archbishop of Rheims and pope under the name of Sylvester II.

Charles, duke of Brabant and Hainault, states that composed the Lower Lorrain, was obliged to yield to a rival more powerful and more fortunate than himself: being betrayed by the bishop of Laon, and unexpectedly seized and delivered to Hugh Capet, he died a

prisoner in the tower of Orleans; and two children, who were unable to defend his death, though one of them succeeded to Lower Lorraine, were the last princes of the male line of Charlemagne. Hugh Capet, who thus raised himself to be king of his peers, did not, however, acquire any additional domain.

C H A P. XXXIX.

*State of France in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries. —
Excommunication of King Robert.*

FRANCE being dismembered, continued to languish under obscure misfortunes from the reign of Charles the Fat to Philip the First, great grandson to Hugh Capet, near two hundred and fifty years; and we shall see whether the crusades, which signalized the reign of Philip I. at the end of the eleventh century, rendered it more flourishing. In the space of time I am mentioning, there was nothing but confusion, tyranny, barbarism, and poverty. Every lord, who had a tolerable estate, coined money; while it was every body's business to debase it. The fine manufactures were in Greece and Italy; for the French could not imitate them in towns that had no privileges, and in a country intirely disunited.

Of all the events of those times, that which is most worthy the attention of a citizen, is the excommunication of King Robert. He had married Bertha, his cousin in the fourth degree; a marriage in itself lawful, and moreover necessary for the welfare of the state. We have seen in our days private persons marry their nieces, and purchase at the ordinary price, the dispensations of Rome, as if Rome had any thing to do with the marriages solemnized at Paris: but the King of France did not meet with the same indulgence. The church of Rome, amidst the contempt and scandal into which it was fallen, dared to impose on the king a penance

penance of seven years, enjoined him to quit his wife, and excommunicated him in case of refusal. The pope interdicted all the bishops who had assisted at his marriage, and ordered them to repair to Rome to beg his pardon. Such audacity appears incredible; but the ignorant superstition of those times might have suffered it; and it might have been occasioned by policy. Gregory V. who thundered out this excommunication, was a German, and governed by Gerbert, formerly archbishop of Rheims, and an enemy of the house of France. The emperor Otho III. who was no friend to Robert, assisted in person at the council, where the excommunication was pronounced: all these particulars render it probable, that reasons of state had as great a share as fanaticism in this disgraceful proceeding.

Historians relate, that such was the effect of this excommunication in France, that the king was forsaken by all his courtiers, and even by his own domestics; and that there staid with him only two servants, who threw into the fire what he left at his meals, from the horror they felt at what had been touched by an excommunicated person. Degraded as human nature was at that time, yet it is by no means probable that the absurdity could be carried so far. The first writer who mentions this stupidity of the court of France, is cardinal Peter Damian, who did not write his account till sixty-five years after: and he relates, that as a punishment of this pretended incest, the queen was brought to bed of a monster; but there is nothing monstrous in this whole affair, except the audacity of the pope, and the weakness of the king, who separated from his wife.

Excommunications and interdictions are thunderbolts that never set a state on fire, unless they meet with combustible materials. There were none at that time, but Robert perhaps might fear that some would be formed.

King Robert's condescension emboldened the popes to such a degree, that his grandson, Philip I. was excommunicated as he had been. The famous Gregory VII.

VII. in the year 1075, threatened to depose him, if he did not clear himself from the crime of simony before his nuncios. Another pope actually excommunicated him. Philip disliked his queen, and was in love with Bertha, the wife of the count of Anjou; he therefore made use of the laws to annul his marriage, under the pretence of kindred: and Bertha his mistress got her union with the count of Anjou dissolved on the same pretence.

At length the king and his mistress were solemnly married by the bishop of Bayeux. They were indeed deserving of censure, but they had at least shewn a certain degree of respect to the laws, in making use of them to cover their faults. It is certain however that one pope had excommunicated Robert for marrying his relation, and another pope excommunicated Philip for repudiating his relation. What appears most singular is, that Urban II. who pronounced this sentence, pronounced it in the king's own dominions at Clermont in Auvergne, where he came to seek for shelter, and in the same council in which he preached the crusade.

However, it does not appear that Philip on his being excommunicated was held in abhorrence by his subjects; and this may give us reason to doubt of Robert's having been so generally abandoned.

It is remarkable that King Henry, Philip's father, was married to a Russian princess, the daughter of a duke named Jaraslau. It is not known whether the Russia from whence this princess came, was Black, White, or Red Russia. Was this princess born a Pagan, a Christian, or a Greek? Did she change her religion to marry the king of France? How happened it in those days, when all communication between the different states of Europe was so very rare, that a king of France should become acquainted with a princess of the country of the ancient Scythians? Who proposed this strange match? The history of those obscure times affords us no satisfactory lights on any of these questions.

It seems probable that Henry I. resolved on this marriage, from the fear of being engaged in some ecclesiastical

clesia
times
of sta
cousin
in Eu
Anne
then c
and it
band,
the lea
times
the kin
ried a
gular
In g
our ow
man n
ment,
the pec
In p
the abj
and the
minds
the cro
the slav
power v
of that
a reput
even the
taught
of geom
from his
pope by
tation o
And yet
who was
the follo
A Fr
having c
of Brant

clerical quarrel. Of all the superstitions of those times, this was not the least prejudicial to the welfare of states; that people were not permitted to marry a cousin of the seventh degree; for almost all the sovereigns in Europe were Henry's relations. However, in 1060, Anne, daughter of Jarasslau, an unknown duke of the then obscure country of Russia, was queen of France; and it is remarkable, that after the death of her husband, she did not enjoy the regency, nor ever made the least pretence to it. Laws change according to the times: the count of Flanders, one of the vassals of the kingdom, was regent, and the queen-dowager married a count of Crepi. These things would appear singular at present, though they were not so then.

In general, if we compare those two centuries with our own, they appear to have been the infancy of human nature, in every thing that related to government, religion, commerce, the arts, and the rights of the people.

In particular, one cannot help being astonished at the abject and scandalous state of the church of Rome, and the influence she continued to maintain over the minds of the people in the midst of her humiliation; the crowd of different popes created by the emperors; the slavish condition of those pontiffs; their immense power when they became masters, and their great abuse of that power. Sylvester II. Gerbert, who had so great a reputation for learning in the tenth century, and was even thought to be a magician, because an Arabian had taught him a little arithmetic and some few elements of geometry; this preceptor of Otho III. who was driven from his archbishopric of Rheims, and afterwards created pope by the emperor Otho III. still preserves the reputation of having been a man of genius and a wise pope. And yet in the chronicle written by Adelmar Chabanois, who was his cotemporary and admirer, we meet with the following anecdote:

A French nobleman, Guy, Viscount de Limoges, having disputed certain rights belonging to the abbey of Brantome with Grimoard, bishop of Angoulême; the
bishop

bishop excommunicated the viscount, and the latter imprisoned the bishop. This reciprocal violence was but too common all over Europe, where force held the place of law.

The respect for the see of Rome in those times of general anarchy, was so great, that the bishop, after being released from his confinement, and the viscount de Limoges, both went from France to Rome to plead their cause before Pope Sylvester II. in full consistory; when, incredible as it may seem, the viscount was condemned to be drawn asunder by four horses; and this sentence would certainly have been put in execution had he not found means to make his escape. The outrage committed by this nobleman in causing a bishop to be imprisoned, who was not his subject; his remorse, his submission to the see of Rome; and the barbarous and absurd sentence of the consistory, altogether afford a lively portrait of the character of those uncivilized times.

Neither Henry I. the son of Robert, nor Philip I. the son of Henry, distinguished themselves by any memorable actions; but in their time their vassals and under vassals conquered kingdoms.

We shall see presently in what manner a few adventurers of the province of Normandy, without either estates or lands, and almost without troops, founded the kingdom of the two Sicilies, which became afterwards so great a subject of contention between the emperors of the dynasty of Swabia and the popes, between the houses of Anjou and Arragon, and between those of Austria and France.

C H A P. XL.

The Conquest of Naples and Sicily by a few Norman Gentlemen.

WHEN Charlemagne assumed the title of emperor, it gave him no more than he could secure by his arms. He pretended to be supreme lord

of

of t
tute
of B
dy f
Apu
pred
Latin
tries.
with
belon
Gree
Otho
in the
Otho
the co
emper
Apuli
called
men.
croach
and th
turn.
Sienna
seemed
and the
preserv
them v
masters
castles,
Latins
tapan's
Constan
Their n
mixture
religion
bitants
any app
Horace
Tasso.
VOL.

of the dutchy of Benevento, which at that time constituted great part of the kingdom of Naples. The dukes of Benevento, more fortunate than the kings of Lombardy stood their ground against him and his successors. Apulia, Calabria, and Sicily were exposed to the depredations of the Arabians. In vain did the Greek and Latin emperors dispute the sovereignty of these countries. A great many private lords shared the spoils with the Saracens. The people did not know who they belonged to, nor whether they were of the Roman, Greek, or Mahometan communion. The emperor Otho I. being the most powerful, exercised his authority in those parts, and erected Capua into a principality. Otho II. had not such good fortune, but was beaten by the combined army of the Greeks and Arabians. The emperors of the East remained then in possession of Apulia and Calabria, which they governed by a deputy called Catapan. Salerno was usurped by private noblemen. The princes of Benevento and Capua, encroached as much as possible on the Catapan's territories, and the latter did them all the mischief he could in his turn. Naples and Gajeta were petty republics, like Sienna and Lucca. The genius of ancient Greece seemed to have taken refuge in these two little states; and there was something truly great in their aiming to preserves themselves free, when all the countries around them were in slavery, and perpetually changing their masters. The Mahometans were quartered in several castles, from whence they plundered the Greeks and Latins both alike: the churches belonging to the Catapan's jurisdiction, were subject to the metropolitan of Constantinople, and the rest to the see of Rome. Their manners were such as might be expected from a mixture of so many different people, governments, and religions. The natural wit and vivacity of the inhabitants was altogether extinguished. It had no longer any appearance of the country that had given birth to Horace and Cicero, and that was one day to produce a Tasso. Such was the state of this fruitful country in

VOL. I. *Gen. Hist.* M m the

the tenth and eleventh centuries, from Gajeta and Garigliano, as far as Otranto.

The prevailing passion of those days consisted in pilgrimages and knight errantry. The times of anarchy are those which produce the greatest flights of heroism; under regular governments we find it more restrained. Fifty or sixty Frenchmen having sailed from the coast of Normandy in 983, on a voyage to Jerusalem, returned by the sea of Naples and arrived at Salerno, at a time when the Mahometans were besieging this city, and the inhabitants had agreed to ransom their liberties. They found the Salernians busy in collecting the money, and the victorious Mussulmen in their camp, securely rioting in brutal debauchery. This handful of strangers reproached the besieged with their pusillanimous behaviour; then sallying out with great intrepidity in the middle of the night, and followed by a few of the inhabitants who dared to imitate their example, they fell unawares upon the Saracen camp, put the enemy to flight, obliged them to re-embark in the greatest confusion, and not only saved the treasures of Salerno, but likewise encreased it with the spoils of the enemy.

The prince of Salerno, greatly surprised, would fain have rewarded them with magnificent presents, but was still more surprised at their refusal: they were for a long time treated at Salerno in such a manner as heroes and the-deliverers of a nation deserved: in short they were prevailed upon to promise to return. The honour annexed to so singular an adventure, soon induced a great many of their countrymen to visit Benevento and Salerno; so that at length the Normans resumed the custom of their forefathers of crossing the seas, in search of an enemy. Sometimes they served the Greek emperor, sometimes the princes of the country, and at other times the popes. Little did they mind in what prince's cause they signalized their prowess, provided they reaped the fruit of their labour. At Naples there started up a duke, who had enslaved the infant republic. This duke of Naples thought himself very happy in

concluding

concl
who
vento
city
first
So
of H
name
Hum
the f
Norm
Willi
termi
would
they m
of his
incurr
again
themse
incred
countr
master
tunes
courage
count
the po
opinio
kings
town
Aff
Drogo
that R
set out
fortune
father
filled a
itself w
followe
in pilgr

concluding an alliance with a handful of Normans, who lent him their assistance against the duke of Benevento. Between the two territories they founded the city of Averfa towards the year 1030, and this was the first sovereignty acquired by their valour.

Soon afterwards, arrived the three sons of Tancred of Hauteville, from the territory of Coutance: their names were William surnamed Fier-a-bras, Drogo and Humphrey. Nothing bears a greater resemblance to the fabulous times. These three brothers, with the Normans of Averfa, attended the Catapan into Sicily; William Fier-a-bras slew the Arabian general and determined the victory in favour of the Greeks, who would have been once more in possession of Sicily, had they not been ungrateful. But the Catapan was afraid of his French auxiliaries; he did them injustice, and incurred their displeasure. They turned their arms against him; and three or four hundred Normans made themselves masters of almost all Apulia. The fact seems incredible: but they were joined by adventurers of the country, who learnt the military art under such expert masters; the Calabrians who wanted to make their fortunes by the sword, seemed to rival the Normans in courage. William Fier-a-bras assumed the title of count of Apulia, without consulting either the emperor, the pope, or the neighbouring lords: he asked only the opinion of his soldiers, as was the case with the first kings of every country. Each Norman captain had a town or a village to his share.

After the decease of Fier-a-bras, his brother¹⁰⁴⁶ Drogo was chosen sovereign of Apulia. Then it was that Robert Guiscard and his two younger brothers set out from Coutance in order to partake of such good fortune. Old Tancred was amazed to see himself the father of a race of conquerors. The Norman name filled all the neighbourhood of Apulia, and even Rome itself with terror. Robert Guiscard and his brother, followed by a great number of their countrymen, went in pilgrimage to Rome in small parties. They walked

incognito, each with a pilgrim's staff, and at length reached Apulia.

The emperor Henry III. who had power enough to lord it over Rome, was not able however to oppose these conquerors. He solemnly granted them the
 1047 investiture of what they had invaded. They were possessed at that time of all Apulia, the county of Averfa, and a moiety of the dutchy of Benevento.

Thus we see a family, which soon after attained the regal dignity, and founded the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily, become a feudatory of the empire. But how happened it that this portion of the empire should be lopped off so very soon, and be made a fief of the holy see, at a time when the popes were scarce possessed of any territory, when they were not yet masters of Rome, and not so much as acknowledged as sovereigns in the marquisate of Ancona, which had been bestowed upon them by Otho the Great? This event is no less wonderful than the conquests of a few gentlemen from Normandy. The ænigma however is thus explained.

1058 Pope Leo IX. was desirous to have the city of Benevento, which had belonged to the princes of the Lombard race, who were dispossessed by Charlemagne. Accordingly the emperor Henry III. gave him this city, in exchange for the fief of Bamberg in Germany: and the supreme pontiffs are to this day masters of Benevento by virtue of that donation. The new Norman princes were dangerous neighbours: no conquests were ever made without great injustice: the Normans were guilty of oppression, and the emperor would have been glad to have had less powerful vassals. Leo IX. after having excommunicated them, prepared to fight them at the head of an army of Germans, which Henry III. sent to his assistance. Historians do not inform us in what manner the spoils were to be divided: they only tell us that the army was numerous, that the pope joined them with Italian troops, who insisted
 1053 with as much eagerness as if it had been for a holy war, and that among the captains there were a great many bishops. The Normans, who had been always
 victorious

victo
 par
 inure
 Hum
 head
 in pi
 retire
 battle
 and
 had b
 Th
 saints
 been
 led fr
 very
 when
 him,
 priso
 the L
 extinc
 of tha
 It r
 more
 midab
 who c
 themse
 the tw
 They
 master
 Henry
 Greek
 Cala
 teville
 conqu
 none c
 * A
 and E.
 † Th
 Salernia

victorious in small numbers, were not above a fourth part so numerous as the pope's troops; but they were inured to war. Robert Guiscard, with his brother Humphrey, and Richard count of Aversa, each at the head of a well disciplined troop, cut the German army in pieces, and put the Italians to flight. The pope retired to Civitade in the Capitanata*, near the field of battle; the Normans pursued him, took him prisoner, and carried him to that very city of Benevento, which had been the first occasion of the dispute.

This pope Leo IX. has been ranked amongst the saints; probably because he repented of his having been the cause of such effusion of blood, and having led such a number of ecclesiastics to battle. It is very certain he repented what he had done, especially when he saw with what respect his conquerors treated him, and how inflexible they were in detaining him prisoner a whole year. They restored Benevento to the Lombard princes, and it was not till after the extinction of this family that the popes took possession of that city.

It may easily be conceived that the Normans were more incensed against the emperor, who had sent a formidable army to oppose them, than against the pope who commanded it. They found it necessary to rid themselves for ever of the pretensions or the right of the two empires between which they were situated. They extended their conquests, and made themselves masters of Calabria and Capua during the minority of Henry IV. and at a time when the government of the Greek empire was still weaker than a minority.

Calabria was subdued by the sons of Tancred of Hauteville, while the descendants of the first deliverers† conquered Capua. These two victorious dynasties had none of those disputes, by which the arms of con-

* A province of the kingdom of Naples, bounded on the N. and E. by the Adriatic. T.

† The author alludes here to the Normans who delivered the Salernians from the Saracens. T.

querors are so often weakened and divided. The utility of history calls upon me to observe here, that Richard of Averfa, who conquered Capua, caused himself to be crowned with the same ceremonies of consecration and the holy oil, as had been practised by Charlemagne's father, the usurper Pepin. The dukes of Benevento had always been crowned in the same manner; and Richard's successors took care to do the same. There cannot be a plainer proof than this, that every prince establishes customs according to his taste.

Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia and Calabria, and Richard count of Averfa and Capua, were both sovereigns by the right of conquest, and both aimed at being entirely independent of the emperors: for this end they had recourse to a measure, which private persons used frequently to take in those times of confusion and rapine, in order to preserve their estates; this was to give them to the church by way of offering, after which they enjoyed them in peace, only paying a small duty or acknowledgment. Such was the resource of the weak in the tempestuous governments of Italy. The Normans, though powerful princes, made use of this as a safeguard against the emperors, whose power might possibly increase. Robert Guiscard and Richard of Capua, when excommunicated by pope Leo IX. detained him in confinement; and these very conquerors, when excommunicated by Nicholas II. thought fit to pay him homage.

- 1059 The duke of Apulia and the count of Capua resolved therefore to put under the protection of the church, not only all they had hitherto taken or conquered, but whatever they might take or conquer hereafter. Duke Robert even did homage to Nicholas II. for Sicily, which was not yet in his possession: he declared himself a feudatory of the holy see for all his dominions, and promised a duty of twelve deniers for each plough, which was a great deal. This homage was an act of political devotion, and might be looked upon in the same light as the St. Peter's pence, which England used to pay to the holy see, or as the two pounds of gold paid

paid to
in shor
kingdo

But
Europ
not ch
have
emper
estates.
church
of the
exercis
same t
became
their n
an ene
having
to Sici
island f
it had
mission
being f

The
that co
Naples
of Sale
mans
posseff
Salerno
neighb
gory V
perors
der of
did no
this ex
countr
last du
Robert

Greg
haught

paid to the same fee by the first kings of Portugal, or in short as the voluntary submission of so many other kingdoms to the church.

But according to all the feudal laws established in Europe, those princes being vassals of the empire, could not chuse another lord paramount. Such a step would have rendered them guilty of rebellion towards the emperor. and given him a just cause to confiscate their estates. But the quarrels which ensued between the church and the empire, and especially the great power of the Norman prince, prevented the emperors from exercising their prerogatives. These conquerors at the same time that they made themselves the pope's vassals, became the protectors, and oftentimes the masters of their new lord paramount. Duke Robert, from being an enemy to the church, became its defender, and having received a standard from the pope, crossed over to Sicily with his brother Roger: they soon wrested this island from the Greeks and the Arabians, between whom it had been divided; and both nations made their submission to the two brothers, in 1067, on condition of being suffered to retain their customs and religion.

Their next view was to compleat the conquests of all that country, which at present constitutes the kingdom of Naples. There were still however remaining the princes of Salerno, whose predecessors had first invited the Normans to that country; but at length they were dispossessed by these very people. Duke Robert took Salerno from them, and they then took shelter in the neighbourhood of Rome, under the protection of Gregory VII. a pope who had been used to make the emperors tremble. Robert who was the vassal and defender of the church pursued them thither: Gregory VII. did not fail to excommunicate him, and the result of this excommunication was the conquest of the whole country of Benevento, which after the decease of the last duke of the Lombard race was seized on by Robert.

Gregory VII. whom we shall see behave with such haughtiness and pride to emperors and kings, was all complaisance

complaisance to the excommunicated Robert. He
 1077 granted him absolution, and in return he received the
 city of Benevento, which has ever since continued in
 possession of the holy see.

Soon after broke out the violent quarrels between the
 emperor Henry IV. and Gregory VII. of which we shall
 take more particular notice hereafter. Henry, in 1084,
 had made himself master of Rome, and was besieging
 the castle, since called by the name of St. Angelo, to
 which the pope was retired. Robert hastened from
 Dalmatia, where he was making new conquests, raised
 the siege of the castle of St. Angelo in spite of the
 Germans and Romans, who were united against him,
 made himself master of the pope's person, and con-
 ducted him to Salerno, where this pope, who had
 deposed so many kings, died the captive, yet at the
 same time under the protection, of a Norman gen-
 tleman.

We must not be at all surprized at such a number of
 romances, in which we are told of knight errants, who
 rose to be potent sovereigns by their exploits, and mar-
 ried into imperial families. This was exactly the case
 of Robert Guiscard, and what happened more than
 once, as we shall see, at the time of the crusades.
 Robert married his daughter to Constantine, son of
 Michael Ducas emperor of Constantinople. This did
 not prove a happy marriage. Michael being soon after
 deposed, Robert had soon the cause of his daughter
 and son-in-law to avenge, and determined to go and
 dethrone the emperor of the East, after having humbled
 the emperor of the West.

The court of Constantinople was a scene of continual
 storms. Michael Ducas was driven from the throne by
 Nicephorus, surnamed Botoniates: and Constantine,
 Robert's son-in-law, was made an eunuch. At length
 Alexius Comnenus, who had afterwards so much reason
 to complain of the crusaders, ascended the throne.
 1084 During these revolutions, Robert was advancing through
 Dalmatia and Macedonia, and had already filled Con-
 stantinople with terror: Bohemond, his son by his first
 wife,

wife,
 attend
 This f
 to be a
 exploit
 The
 end to
 daught
 account
 as a fre
 presum
 She ou
 of the
 elevatio
 world n

Of Sicily

THE
 no
 firmly fe
 count R
 duke Ro
 country,
 of Napl
 wards to
 deavoure
 Roger.
 But ho
 vereign o
 lia, took
 be time fo
 queror, h
 and his b
 Robert G
 Vol. I.

wife, and who was afterwards so famous in the crusades, attended him in this expedition to conquer an empire. This shews us that Alexius Comnenus had good reason to be afraid of the crusaders, since Bohemond began his exploits with attempting to dethrone him.

The death of Robert in the isle of Corfu, put an end to his enterprizes. The princess Anna Comnena, daughter of the emperor Alexius, and who wrote an account of some of these transactions, speaks of Robert as a freebooter, and expresses great indignation at his presuming to marry his daughter to an emperor's son. She ought to have remembered that even the history of the empire abounds with examples of extraordinary elevations of fortune, and that every thing in this world must yield to force and power.

C H A P. XLI.

Of Sicily in particular and the Power of the Legates in that Island.

THE idea of conquering the empire of Constantinople expired with Robert: but his family were firmly settled in their possessions in Italy. His brother, count Roger, remained master of Sicily: and his son, duke Roger, continued in possession of almost all that country, which now goes by the name of the kingdom of Naples. Bohemond, his other son, went afterwards to conquer Antioch, after he had in vain endeavoured to divide the dominions of his brother duke Roger.

But how happened it, that neither count Roger sovereign of Sicily, nor his nephew Roger duke of Apulia, took upon them the title of kings? There must be time for every thing. Robert Guiscard, the first conqueror, had been invested as duke by pope Nicholas II. and his brother Roger had received the investiture of Robert Guiscard as count of Sicily. These ceremonies

conferred only bare titles, and brought with them no additional power. But this count of Sicily acquired a right, which is still preserved, and which no king in Europe has ever enjoyed : he became a second pope in that island.

The Roman pontiffs had been accustomed to send ministers to every part of Christendom, who were called legates *a latere*, and exercised jurisdiction over all the churches, exacted the *tenths*, conferred benefices, and extended the papal power, as far as conjunctures and the interests of kings would permit. Temporal concerns, by being intermixed, as is so generally the case, with spiritualities, were subject to their jurisdiction ; and they even went so far as to take cognizance of civil causes. Provided there was but the least spiritual mixture in any worldly affair, as in marriages, wills, and promises by oath, it was sure to belong to their court. They were proconsuls, whom the ecclesiastical emperor of Christendom, deputed to every part of the western world. It was by this policy that Rome, though impotent, and in a state of perpetual anarchy, enslaved by the Germans, and exposed to all the scourges that afflict mankind, continued nevertheless the mistress of the world. Hence the history of every nation is the history of Rome.

Urban II. sent a legate into Sicily as soon as Roger had wrested that island from the Mahometans and Greeks, and established the Latin church there. Of all countries, this appeared to stand the most in need of a legate, who might settle the hierarchy among a people one half of whom were Mussulmen, and the other half of the Greek communion. Yet this proved the only country from whence the legates were proscribed. Count Roger, the benefactor of the Latin Church, while he restored Sicily to her communion, could not bear to have a king sent, under the name of a legate, into an island which he himself had subdued.

Pope Urban II. wholly engaged in the scheme of the crusades, and willing to keep fair with a family of heroes, whose assistance would be necessary to this great enterprise,

enterp
bull to
and cr
of the
rights
same t
mous p
gative
popes
Sicily h
kind is
evident
be a po
is furt
claim i
than th
had to c
yet in
gentlen
gates o
The
inherita
king of
time wa
belong
to the
form of
the emp
duke, b
of the c
This
There v
of a Je
cletus, a
Jewish h
Roger a
Lothariu
this Ana
These
perors as

enterprise, granted in 1098, the last year of his life, a bull to count Roger, whereby he recalled his legate, and created Roger and his successors hereditary legates of the holy see in Sicily, investing them with all the rights and privileges of that dignity, which was at the same time both spiritual and temporal. Hence the famous prerogative called the *Sicilian monarchy*, a prerogative annexed to that kingdom, and which succeeding popes have attempted to abolish, but the kings of Sicily have resolutely maintained. If a privilege of this kind is incompatible with the Christian hierarchy, it is evident that Urban had no authority to grant it: if it be a point of discipline no way contrary to religion, it is further evident, that every kingdom has a right to claim it. In the main this privilege is nothing more than the right which Constantine and all the emperors had to direct the civil administration of their dominions; yet in all Catholic Europe, there was only a Norman gentleman, who dared to assert this prerogative at the gates of Rome.

The son of this count Roger succeeded to the whole inheritance of the Norman family, and was crowned king of Sicily and Apulia. Naples, which at that time was but an inconsiderable city, did not as yet belong to him, and therefore could not give a name to the kingdom. It had long maintained itself in the form of a republic, under a duke who paid homage to the emperors of Constantinople; and hitherto this duke, by means of presents, had escaped the ambition of the conquering family.

This first king Roger did homage to the holy see. There were at that time two popes; one the son of a Jew named Leon, who took the name of Anacletus, and whom St. Bernard calls *Judaicum sobolem*, a Jewish breed; the other was called Innocent II. King Roger acknowledged Anacletus, because the emperor Lotharius II. acknowledged Innocent; and it was to this Anacletus that he paid his empty homage.

These Norman conquerors were considered by the emperors as usurpers. Hence St. Bernard, who was concerned

cerned in all the public affairs of popes and kings, wrote against Roger as well as against this son of a Jew, who had obtained the pontifical dignity by bribery; *the one, says he, has usurped the chair of St. Peter, the other has usurped Sicily, and it rests with Cæsar to punish them.*

King Roger supported Anacletus, who was still acknowledged at Rome. Lotharius availing himself of this opportunity to despoil the Normans of their conquests, advanced towards Apulia along with pope Innocent II. It seems that the Normans had good reason not to depend on the emperors, but to settle a barrier between the empire and Naples. Roger had scarce ascended the throne, when he saw himself in danger of losing all his dominions. He was besieging Naples when the emperor marched against him. Roger was defeated in several battles, and almost all his possessions
 1137 on the continent were taken from him. St. Bernard accompanied the emperor and the pope. He in vain endeavoured to compromise the dispute. Roger was obliged to retire into Sicily. In the mean time the emperor died, which produced a total change of affairs. King Roger and his son recovered their dominions. Pope Innocent II. having been at length recognized at Rome, entered into a league with the princes, on whom Lotharius had bestowed those dominions; and continuing the implacable enemy of king Roger he put himself, like Leo IX. at the head of an army, but was
 1139 defeated and taken prisoner as he had been. What could he do in such a situation? He acted as his predecessors had done; he granted absolutions and investitures, and after he had called the emperor to his aid against the Norman family, he now engaged this very family to defend him against the empire.

Soon after this, the king made himself master of Naples and of the little territory that was still remaining to render his kingdom compleat, from Gaieta to Brindisi. Thus the monarchy was established in its present form; Naples quietly became the capital of the kingdom, and the liberal arts began in some measure to revive once more in those fruitful provinces.

After

A
of C
we sh
Norm
titud
from
the t
mind
been
not h

The

W
of the
confid
notwi
stantly
Alfred
lapsed
Anglo
its nev
the kin
to par
came f
about
chase
sand p
impose
most o
occasio
humili
Can
the Gr
crueltie

After having seen in what manner a few gentlemen of Coutance founded the kingdom of Naples and Sicily, we shall now see how a peer of France who was duke of Normandy, made the conquest of England. The multitude of invasions and emigrations, which continued from the end of the fourth century to the beginning of the fourteenth, and ended with the crusades, fill the mind with astonishment. All the nations of Europe have been intermixed, and there is hardly a country that has not had its usurpers.

C H A P. XLII.

The Conquest of England by William Duke of Normandy.

WHILE the sons of Tancred of Hauteville founded kingdoms at such a distance, the dukes of their country acquired one, that is become more considerable than the two Sicilies. The British nation, notwithstanding its pride, was destined to see itself constantly governed by foreigners. After the death of Alfred, which happened in the year 900, England relapsed into confusion and barbarism. The ancient Anglo-Saxons, its former conquerors, and the Danes its new usurpers, constantly disputed the possession of the kingdom; and fresh Danish pirates frequently came to partake of the spoils. These pirates at length became so formidable, and the English were so weak, that about the year 1000, the latter were obliged to purchase their ransom by a payment of forty-eight thousand pounds sterling: and to raise this sum, a tax was imposed, which lasted for a long time in England; like most other taxes which continue to be raised, after the occasion ceases for which they were first imposed. This humiliating tribute was called Danish money, *Danegelt*.

Canute king of Denmark, who has been surnamed the Great, though he only distinguished himself by his cruelties, reduced both Denmark and England under his

his dominion in 1017. The native English were then treated like slaves; and the authors of those times confess, that when an Englishman met a Dane, he was obliged to stop till the Dane had passed by.

The family of Canute being extinct in 1041, the states of the kingdom recovered their liberty, and conferred the crown on Edward, a descendant of the Anglo-Saxons, who was called the Saint and Confessor. One of the great faults, or great misfortunes of this king, was his having no children by his wife Editha, daughter of the most powerful lord in the kingdom: he hated his wife, as well as his own mother, for reasons of state, and removed them both from his court. The sterility of this marriage contributed to his cannonization: for it was pretended that he made a vow of chastity; a vow which at any rate would have been rash in a husband, and absurd in a king who wanted heirs. This vow, however, if real, prepared new chains for England.

The monks have asserted that this Edward was the first king in Europe, who had the gift of curing the evil. He had already restored to sight seven or eight blind persons, when a poor woman who was attacked with a cold humour, presented herself before him; he instantly cured her by making the sign of the cross, and from being barren caused her to become fruitful. The kings of England since that period have constantly arrogated to themselves a privilege, not of making the barren fruitful or of restoring sight to the blind, but of touching scrofulous patients whom they cannot cure.

St. Louis, king of France, as lord paramount over the kings of England, touched likewise for the scrofula; and his successors preserved the same right. William III. neglected it in England; and a time will come, when reason, which is beginning to make some progress in France, will totally abolish this custom there.

You still perceive that the manners and customs of those times had not the least resemblance to ours. William duke of Normandy, who conquered England, was so far from having any right to that kingdom, that he had not even any to Normandy, if a right is constituted
by

by bir
marr
laife,
then,
bine,
concu
the Je
tion.
it; an
of sha
sign W
writte
signat
possess
govern
prince
been
dutchy
terity
right.
ceived
fessor
The ri
state in
Spain
men;
the rac
eviden
Edward
heritan
family
that of
Bastard
inherit
Englan
had ma
crown
seen.
livered
yielded

by birth; for his father, duke Robert, who was never married, had him by the daughter of a skinner of Falaise, whom history calls *Harlot*, a word that signified then, and still signifies in the English language *concubine*, or *mistress*. The custom of keeping a number of concubines, authorised throughout all the East and by the Jewish law, was prohibited in the gospel dispensation. General practice however still gave a sanction to it; and so far was it from being considered as a matter of shame, that William the Conqueror frequently used to sign *William the Bastard*. There is still extant a letter written by him to count Alain of Britany, with this signature. Bastards frequently inherited their fathers' possessions; for in all countries where men are not governed by fixed laws, it is certain that the will of the prince will always be the only code. William who had been declared, by his father and the states, heir of the dutchy, maintained himself in the succession by his dexterity and valour against all those who disputed his right. He reigned peaceably in Normandy and received homage from Britany; when Edward the Confessor dying, he laid claim to the kingdom of England. The right of succession was not then established in any state in Europe: the crown of Germany was elective; Spain was divided between the Christians and Mussulmen; Lombardy every day changed its master; and the race of Charlemagne dethroned in France, made it evident what force could do against the right of blood. Edward the Confessor had not enjoyed the throne by inheritance; and Harold his successor was not of the same family; but he had the most indisputable of all rights, that of the suffrages of the whole nation. William the Bastard had neither the right of election, nor that of inheritance, nor was he supported by any party in England. He pretended, that in a former voyage he had made to this island, king Edward had devised the crown to him by a will; which, however, nobody had seen. He also pretended, that he had formerly delivered Harold from prison, and that this prince had yielded up to him his right to the crown of England.

These

These weak reasons were, however, supported by a strong army.

The barons of Normandy, who assembled in the form of a diet, refused to grant their duke money for this expedition; because, if he should not succeed, Normandy would be impoverished; and his success would render it a province to England: yet many Normans hazarded their fortune with the duke. One single nobleman, named Fitz-Osborn, equipped forty vessels at his own expence; the earl of Flanders, William's father-in-law, assisted him with money. Pope Alexander II. engaged in his interests, and excommunicated all those who opposed his designs. This was making a ridiculous use of religion, but the people were accustomed to these profanations, and the princes profited by them. William sailed from St. Valery with a numerous fleet; but the exact number of the vessels and
 Oa. soldiers is not known. He landed on the coast of
 14. Sussex, and soon afterwards was fought in that county
 1066 the famous battle of Hastings, which alone decided the fate of England. The old chronicles inform us, that in the first rank of the Norman army was an Esquire, named *Taillefer*, or *Cut Iron*, mounted on an armed horse, who sang the song of Roland, which was so long in the mouth of every Frenchman, and of which there is not the least fragment remaining. This Taillefer, after singing this song, in which he was accompanied by all the army, was the first to throw himself into the English ranks, where he was soon cut to pieces. King Harold and the Duke of Normandy quitted their horses and fought on foot. The battle lasted six hours. The cavalry, who fought in armour, and began every where else to be considered as the strength of an army, do not appear to have been employed in this battle. The troops on each side consisted of infantry. Harold and his two brothers were slain in the engagement; and the conqueror marched towards London, with a banner carried before him, which had been consecrated by the pope. This banner was the standard under which all the bishops assembled in his favour;
 I they

the
 the
 not
 S
 tion
 was
 gran
 V
 this
 Har
 of t
 time
 a co
 who
 who,
 redu
 the f
 king
 bari
 king
 the a
 ceiver
 pation
 Wi
 severa
 trated
 his re
 Saxon
 Norm
 shared
 came
 at leas
 an exa
 longin
 and it
 age to
 thousan
 make a
 hundre
 in this
 Vol.

they came to the gates, attended by the magistrates of the city, and offered him the crown, which they could not refuse to the conqueror.

Some writers speak of this coronation as a free election, an act authorised by the English parliament. It was indeed the authority of slaves trained to war, who granted their master the liberty of scourging them.

William having received a banner from the pope for this expedition, in return sent him the banner of King Harold, who had been slain in the battle, and a small part of the little treasure which a king of England in those times could be supposed to be possessed of. This was a considerable present however for Pope Alexander II. who was still disputing his see with Honorius II. and who, in consequence of a long civil war in Rome, was reduced to a state of indigence. Thus a barbarian, the son of a prostitute, and the murderer of a lawful king, divided the spoils of that king with another barbarian; for take away the titles of duke of Normandy, king of England, and pope, and we shall have only the action of a Norman robber and a Lombard receiver; and to this, in fact, may every kind of usurpation be reduced.

William knew as well how to govern as to conquer: several rebellions extinguished, Danish invasions frustrated, and rigorous laws severely executed, signalized his reign. The Ancient Britons, Danes, and Anglo-Saxons, were all involved in the same slavery. The Normans, who had helped him to obtain the victory, shared the lands of the conquered; and from hence came all the Norman families, whose descendants, or at least their names, still subsist in England. He caused an exact inventory to be taken of all the goods belonging to his subjects, of what nature soever they were; and it is pretended, that from thence he took advantage to raise in England a revenue of four hundred thousand pounds sterling; which at present would make about five millions sterling, and more than an hundred millions of French livres. It is evident that in this instance the historians must be mistaken; for

England, Scotland, and Ireland do not at present raise so large a revenue, if we deduct what is levied for the payment of the national debt. This is however certain, that William abolished all the laws of the country, in order to introduce those of Normandy. He ordered that the lawyers should plead in the Norman tongue; and all the public acts were written in that language till the reign of Edward the Third. He was desirous that the language of the conquerors should be that of the country, and schools were established to teach it in all the cities and borough towns in the kingdom. This language was French, mixed with a little Danish; a barbarous dialect, which was in no respect superior to that spoken in England. It is pretended that he not only treated the conquered nation with severity, but also affected a whimsical and capricious kind of tyranny; and they mention as an example of it, the law called *couvre feu*, or *curfew*; by which the people were obliged, at the sound of a bell, to extinguish their fires at eight o'clock in the evening. But this law, so far from being tyrannical, was only an ancient regulation, established in almost all the towns of the North; and which was for a long time observed in monasteries. The houses were built with wood, and the fear of fire was then one of the most important objects of general concern.

He is likewise reproached with having destroyed all the villages, within the compass of fifteen leagues, to make a forest, in which he might enjoy the pleasure of hunting. Such an action is too ridiculous to be probable. Historians do not consider, that a new plantation would require at least twenty years to render it a forest fit for hunting. He is said to have planted this forest in 1080; but he was then sixty years of age, and what probability is there that a man of sense would at that time of life destroy villages to plant a tract of land of fifteen leagues in circumference with wood, in hopes of one day hunting there?

The conqueror of England was the terror of Philip I. king of France, who strove, when it was too late, to
humble

humb
at th
cross
Fran

Ne
pear
to thi
the ti
to de
Engla
of St.
land
about
house
too la
tribut
told,
instea
in Eng
he sho
posal,
This
the fa
before
crusad
will be
state o

Of the

M
centur
doms;
having
Volodi

humble so powerful a vassal, and invaded Maine, which at that time depended on Normandy; but William crossed the sea, retook Maine, and obliged the king of France to sue for a peace.

Never did the pretensions of the court of Rome appear in a more singular manner, than in its behaviour to this prince. Pope Gregory VII. took advantage of the time in which he was engaged in a war with France, to demand his paying him homage for the kingdom of England. This homage was founded on the payment of St. Peter's pence, which had been granted by England to the church of Rome, and which amounted to about ten pence of the present English money for each house: an offering which in England was thought to be too large an alms, and which the pope considered as a tribute. William the Conqueror caused the pope to be told, that he might possibly continue the alms; but instead of paying homage, he would forbid his people in England to acknowledge any other pope than whom he should approve. Thus Gregory the Seventh's proposal, by being too presumptuous, became ridiculous. This is the same pope who overturned Europe to raise the sacerdotal dignity over that of the empire: but before we mention that memorable quarrel, and the crusades which took their rise about the same time, it will be right to describe to you in a few words the state of the other countries of Europe at that period.

C H A P. XLIII.

Of the State of Europe in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.

MUSCOVY had begun to be a little acquainted with Christianity towards the end of the tenth century. The women were destined to convert kingdoms; a sister of the Emperors Basilus and Constantine having married a great duke of Muscovy, named Volodimer, prevailed on her husband to be baptized.

The Muscovites, although slaves to their prince, did not however immediately follow his example, and in those ages of ignorance adopted nothing from the Greek church, except its superstitions.

The dukes of Muscovy of those days were not called Czars or Tzars, or Tchards; nor did they assume this title till they made themselves masters of those countries about Casan, which belonged to the Tsars. Tsar is a Slavonian term taken from the Persian language; and in the Slavonian Bible, King David is called the Tscar David. It was likewise a woman who was the means of introducing Christianity into Poland about the same time. Micisslas, duke of Poland, was converted by his wife, who was sister to the duke of Bohemia. I have already observed that the Bulgarians received the faith in the same manner. Giselle, sister to the emperor Henry II. converted her husband the king of Hungary, in the first year of the eleventh century. Thus it is certain, that half Europe is indebted to women for its Christianity.

Sweden, in which it had been preached so early as the ninth century, was again relapsed into idolatry. Bohemia and all the country on the north of the Elbe renounced Christianity in the year 1013; all the eastern coast of the Baltic Sea was inhabited by Pagans: in 1047, Hungary returned to Paganism; but all these nations were even much farther removed from civilization than from Christianity.

Sweden, which was probably for a long time exhausted of its inhabitants by its ancient emigrations, with which Europe had been overflowed, appeared in the eighth, ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, in a manner buried in barbarism; and being unengaged in war, and without any commerce with its neighbours, it had no share in any great event, and on this account was probably the more happy.

Poland, which was much more barbarous than it was Christian, preserved till the thirteenth century all the customs of the ancient Sarmatians; such as that of killing the

the ch
that w

Alb

ance,

out t

middl

fideral

nation

the tr

chang

The

less ex

In the

and or

and A

We

nobler

Calabr

Floren

magist

the em

freedom

The

Savoy,

ginnin

the em

rienne,

obtain

dom o

The

more o

them

so that

grande

amidst

a series

greater

The

more p

the

the children that were born imperfect, and the old men that were past their labour.

Albert, surnamed the Great, in those ages of ignorance, made a journey into Poland, purposely to root out these horrid customs, which continued till the middle of the thirteenth century; but it was a considerable time before he could succeed. All the other nations of the North lived after a manner equally savage; the true state of human nature before it has been changed by art.

The empire of Constantinople was neither more nor less extended than we have seen it in the ninth century. In the West it defended itself against the Bulgarians, and on the East, North, and South against the Turks and Arabians.

We have seen in general the state of Italy: private noblemen enjoyed all the country from Rome to the Calabrian Sea; and the Normans had the greatest part. Florence, Milan, and Pavia, were governed by their magistrates, under the counts or dukes nominated by the emperors: Bologna indeed enjoyed a state of greater freedom.

The house of Maurienne, from which the dukes of Savoy, now kings of Sardinia are descended, was beginning to establish itself. It possessed, as a fief of the empire, the hereditary county of Savoy and Maurienne, ever since Berthol, the stock of this family, had obtained, in the year 888, that small part of the kingdom of Burgundy.

There were an hundred noblemen in France who were more considerable than the counts of Savoy; but all of them have gradually given way to a superior power, so that there are no longer any remains of their former grandeur; whereas the house of Maurienne, concealed amidst its mountains, has increased in power through a series of ages, and is at length become equal to the greatest monarchs.

The Swiss and Grisons, who formed a state four times more powerful than that of Savoy, and who were likewise detached

detached from the kingdom of Burgundy were under the government of bailiffs nominated by the emperor.

Two maritime cities of Italy began to rise, not by those sudden invasions, which have formed the rights and prerogatives of almost all the princes who have passed in review before us; but by a wise industry, which also soon degenerated into the spirit of conquest. These two cities were Genoa and Venice. Genoa, celebrated in the time of the Romans, considered Charlemagne as her restorer; for this emperor rebuilt the city some time after it had been destroyed by the Goths. It was governed by counts under Charlemagne, and his first descendants; but in the tenth century it was sacked by the Mahometans, and almost all its citizens led into slavery. However, as this was a trading port, it was soon re peopled, and the traffic, which had made it flourish, served to re-establish its grandeur: it then became a republic, and took Corsica from the Arabians. The popes required a tribute for that island, not only because they had been heretofore possessed of patrimonies in that country, but because they pretended to be lords paramount over all the countries taken from the Infidels. The Genoese paid this tribute at the beginning of the eleventh century; but it was not long before they freed themselves from it under the pontificate of Lewis II. At length their ambition increasing with their riches, from being merchants, they resolved to become conquerors.

The city of Venice, which was far from being so ancient as Genoa, affected the frivolous honour of having enjoyed a more ancient liberty, while it possessed the solid glory of a much superior power. This was at first the retreat of fishermen and a few fugitives, who settled there in the beginning of the fifth century, when the Huns and the Goths ravaged Italy; there was then no other town than a few huts on the Rialto. The name of Venice was not then known; and this Rialto was so far from being free, that for thirty years it was only a borough belonging to Padua, which governed it by its consuls: but the vicissitude of human affairs has since laid Padua under the yoke of Venice.

Th
ackn
it is
forgo
Th
not be
magis
and c
It v
a trib
familie
subsist
witho
may b
chasing
Her
death
the ni
numbe
forme
that c
inhabit
comme
is not
even th
renger,
empero
the pri
were ob
of rent
Otho I
this pet
was by
salage;
empero
the pro
matia,
middle
the title
riched

There is not the least proof that Venice enjoyed an acknowledged liberty under the kings of the Lombards: it is much more probable that its inhabitants then lay forgotten in their marshes.

The Rialto, and the little neighbouring islands, did not begin, till the year 709, to be governed by their own magistrates. They were then independent of Padua, and considered themselves as a republic.

It was in 709 they had their first doge, who was only a tribune of the people, elected by the citizens. Several families, who gave their votes to this first doge, still subsist; these are the most ancient nobles in Europe, without exception; and sufficiently prove, that nobility may be acquired without possessing a castle, or purchasing patents of a sovereign.

Heraclea was the first seat of this republic till the death of its third doge, and it was not till the end of the ninth century that these islanders, increasing in number, gave to the assemblage of little islands, which formed a town, the name of Venice, from the name of that coast which was called *Terra Venetorum*. As the inhabitants of these marshes could not subsist without commerce, necessity was the origin of their power. It is not yet certainly decided, whether this republic was even then intirely independent; for we find, that Berenger, who had been for some time acknowledged emperor in Italy, granted the doge, in the year 950, the privilege of coining money: and even these doges were obliged to send annually to the emperors, by way of rent or service, a mantle of cloth of gold; but Otho III. in the year 998, excused them from paying this petty kind of tribute: yet the true power of Venice was by no means lessened by these slight tokens of vassalage; for while the Venetians paid this mantle to the emperors, they acquired, by their money and their arms, the province of Istria, and almost the whole coast of Dalmatia, Spalatto, Ragusa, and Narenza. About the middle of the tenth century their doge began to assume the title of Duke of Dalmatia: but Venice was less enriched by its conquests than by its trade, which even surpassed

surpassed that of Genoa; for while the barons of Germany and France were erecting castles and oppressing the people, the Venetians drew from them their money by supplying them with all the merchandises of the East. The Mediterranean was already covered with their ships, and they enriched themselves by the ignorance and barbarism of the northern nations of Europe.

C H A P. XLIV.

Of Spain and the Mahometans of that Kingdom, till the Beginning of the twelfth Century.

SPAIN continued to be divided between the Mahometans and Christians: but these last did not possess a fourth part; and even that was the most barren corner of all the country. Asturia, the princes of which took the title of king of Leon; a part of old Castile, governed by counts; Barcelona, and half of Catalonia, subject likewise to their counts; Navarre, which had a king; and a part of Arragon, which had been for some time united to Navarre; these were the possessions of the Christians. The Moors were masters of Portugal, Murcia, Andalusia, Valentia, Granada and Tortosa; and their dominion extended to the heart of the country, beyond the mountains of Castile and Saragossa. The residence of the Mahometan kings was at Cordova, where they built that large mosque, which has an arched roof supported by three hundred and sixty-five columns of a very curious marble, and which still bears amongst the Christians the name of *mesquita* or mosque, notwithstanding its being used as a cathedral.

The arts flourished amongst these people; while luxury, magnificence and gallantry reigned at the court of the Moorish kings. Tournaments and tiltings were perhaps the invention of these Arabians; they had also shows and theatres, which, rude as they were,

proved

proved
than
try in
and p
Leon
to pu
fician
solved
Cor
Guad
pome
to effe
rupted
the ter
prince
Murci
This
power
still;
they r
quentl
Alphon
gave h
king of
Jealo
than an
pire ca
fity, a
neighb
but fev
work th
find Sa
mother
Don C
country
In i
varre a
Castile,
of Don
VOL.

proved at least, that other nations had less politeness than these Mahometans. Cordova was the only country in the West where geometry, astronomy, chymistry and physick were cultivated. Sancho the Fat, king of Leon, was obliged, in the year 956, to go to Cordova, to put himself under the care of a famous Arabian physician, who, being invited to come to the king, resolved that the king should come to him.

Cordova is a delightful country, watered by the Guadalquivir, where groves of citrons, oranges and pomegranates, perfume the air, and every thing invites to effeminacy. At length the Moorish kings were corrupted by luxury and pleasure. Their dominions, in the tenth century, like those of almost all the Christian princes, were divided into little kingdoms. Toledo, Murcia, Valencia, and even Huesca, had their kings. This was the proper time for crushing this divided power: but the Spanish Christians were more divided still; they were continually at war amongst themselves; they reunited only to betray each other; and frequently entered into alliances with the Mussulmen. Alphonso V. king of Leon, in the year 1000, even gave his sister Theresa in marriage to sultan Abdala, king of Toledo.

Jealousy produces more crimes among petty princes, than among great sovereigns. The fate of a great empire can be decided only by war; while surprisals, perfidy, assassinations and poisonings are practised by neighbouring rivals, who having much ambition, and but few means of gratifying it, set every engine to work that can supply the place of strength. Thus we find Sancho Garcias, count of Castile, poisoning his mother at the end of the tenth century; and his son Don Garcia was stabbed by three noblemen of that country as he was going to be married.

In 1035, Ferdinand, son of Sancho, king of Navarre and Arragon, reunited to his dominions Old Castile, which his family had inherited by the murder¹⁰³⁶ of Don Garcia, together with the kingdom of Leon,

which he took from his brother-in-law whom he slew in battle.

Castile then became a kingdom, and Leon was only one of its provinces. Ferdinand, however, not contented with having deprived his brother-in-law of his kingdom and life, took also Navarre from his own brother, whom he caused to be assassinated in a battle which he fought against him. This is the Ferdinand on whom the Spaniards have bestowed the name of *Great*; perhaps to dishonour a title, too often lavished on usurpers.

His father, Don Sancho, who was likewise surnamed the Great, having succeeded to the counts of Castile, and married one of his sons to the princess of the Asturias, had caused himself to be proclaimed emperor, and Don Ferdinand resolved also to assume the same title. It is certain, that there never was, nor can be, a title settled on sovereigns, except those which they are willing to assume, and custom has given them. The name of emperor every where signified the heir to the Cæsars, and the master of the Roman empire, or at least one who pretended to be so. It is therefore by no means probable, that this could be the distinguishing title of a prince, whose power was but ill established, and who governed only a fourth part of Spain.

The emperor Henry III. and not Henry II. as many authors affirm, mortified the Castilian pride, by demanding homage of Ferdinand for his little states as fiefs of the empire. It is difficult to say which was the most idle pretension, that of the German emperor or that of the Spaniard: but these vain fancies had no effect, for the dominions of Ferdinand remained a little the kingdom.

Roderick, surnamed the Cid, who actually married Chimene whose father he had murdered, lived in the reign of this Ferdinand. All those who know this history only from the Tragedy, so celebrated in the last age, believe that king Ferdinand was in possession of Andalusia.

The

The famous exploits of the Cid consisted at first in his assisting Don Sancho, Ferdinand's eldest son, to strip his brothers and sisters of the inheritance left them by their father. But Don Sancho being assassinated in one of these unjust expeditions, his brothers entered again into the possession of their estates.

1073

At that time there were near twenty kings in Spain, some of whom were Christians and others Mahometans ; besides a considerable number of poor but independent lords, who came on horseback completely armed, and followed by several esquires, to offer their services to the princes or princesses who were at war. This custom, which had already spread over Europe, was no where in such credit as in Spain. The princes, in whose cause these knights engaged, girded them with a belt, and presented them with a sword, with which they lightly touched their shoulder. The Christian knights had other ceremonies at their dubbing, and watched their arms before an altar of the virgin Mary : but the Mussulmen were contented with girding on a scimitar. This was the origin of knight errantry, and of such numbers of single combats ; the most celebrated of which was that fought after the death of king Sancho, who was assassinated while he was besieging his sister Ouraca in the city of Zamora. Three knights maintained the innocence of the Infanta against Don Diego de Lara, by whom she was accused. They fought hand to hand one after the other, in the presence of judges named by both parties, when Don Diego overthrew and killed two of the Infanta's knights ; but the horse of the third having the reins of his bridle cut, and carrying his master out of the lists, the combat was adjudged to be undecided.

Of all these knights the Cid distinguished himself most against the Mussulmen. Many of them ranged themselves under his banner, and all together, with their esquires and horsemen in armour, composed an army covered with iron, and mounted on the finest horses in the country. The Cid conquered more than one petty Moorish king, and having at length fortified

himself in the city of Alcafar, formed there a little sovereignty.

At length he prevailed on his master Alphonso VI. king of Old Castile, to lay siege to the city of Toledo, and offered him all his knights for that enterprize. The report of this siege, and the Cid's reputation, attracted many knights and princes from France and Italy, particularly Raymond count of Toulouse, and two princes of the blood of France, of the branch of Burgundy. Hiaja, the Mahometan king, was the son of one of the most generous princes, whose name has been preserved by history. Almamon, his father, had afforded an asylum in Toledo to this very king Alphonso, when persecuted by his brother Sancho: they had lived a long time together in the most intimate friendship; and Almamon was so far from detaining him, when after the death of Sancho he became a king, and consequently an object to be feared, that he gave him part of his treasures; and, it is even said, that tears were shed on both sides at parting. Several of the Mahometan knights rode forth from the city to reproach king Alphonso for his ingratitude to his benefactor, and more than one single combat was fought under the walls of Toledo.

1085 The siege continued a year, when Toledo capitulated on condition that the Mussulmen should be treated in the same manner as they had behaved to the Christians, and that they should leave them the enjoyment of their religion and laws: a promise which they at first kept, but which time made them violate. All New Castile afterwards submitted to the Cid, who took possession of it in the name of Alphonso; and Madrid, an inconsiderable place, that was one day to become the capital of Spain, was for the first time in the power of the Christians.

Many families came from France in order to settle in Toledo, and privileges were granted them that are still called franchises in Spain. King Alphonso immediately called an assembly of bishops, who, without the concurrence of the people, which was before thought necessary,

necess
ric of
requer
enjoye
the pri
the con
great r
the ar
into a
phonso
discreti
mosque
archbis
petition
these p
Alph
the swo
licy or
new kin
ceived
whether
Moors
consequ
high ho
it is fro
Alphon
his fath
from Af
in so im
ever is v
bility.
ported
general
who rei
the assist
betrayed
but also
length,
over him
who was

necessary, promoted a priest named Bernard to the bishopric of Toledo, on whom pope Urban II. at the king's request, conferred the primacy of Spain. The church enjoyed almost all the advantages of this conquest; but the primate made an imprudent use of it, by violating the conditions the king had sworn to the Moors. The great mosque was to belong to the Mahometans; but the archbishop, during the king's absence, turned it into a church, and raised a sedition against him. Alphonso returned to Toledo, irritated by the prelates indiscretion, and appeased the tumult by restoring the mosque to the Arabians, and threatening to punish the archbishop. The Mahometans themselves however, petitioned him in favour of the Christian prelate, and these people were submissive and contented.

Alphonso enlarged the dominions he had gained by the sword of the Cid, by a marriage, either from policy or inclination, with Zaid, daughter of Benadat, a new king of the Moors in Andalusia, with whom he received many cities as her dowry: we are not told whether Alphonso's wife embraced Christianity. The Moors at that time were considered as a people of great consequence, and an alliance with them was deemed an high honour. The surname *Rodriguez* was Moorish; and it is from hence that the Spaniards were called *Maranas*. Alphonso is reproached for having in conjunction with his father-in-law called into Spain other Mahometans from Africa: but it is hard to believe that he could act in so impolitic a manner: the conduct of kings however is very often repugnant to all the rules of probability. Be that as it may, an army of Moors was transported from Africa into Spain, and increased the general confusion of the kingdom. The Miramolin, who reigned in Morocco, sent his general Abenada to the assistance of the king of Andalusia. This general betrayed, not only to the king to whom he was sent, but also the Miramolin, in whose name he came. At length, the Miramolin, enraged against him, went over himself in person to fight his perfidious general, who was making war on the other Mahometants, while
the

the Christians were as much divided amongst themselves.

Spain was thus torn to pieces by the Mahometans and Christians, when the Cid, Don Roderick, at the head of his knights, subdued the kingdom of Valencia. There were few sovereign princes in Spain more powerful than he; but whether he preferred the title of Cid, or whether the spirit of chivalry rendered him faithful to king Alphonso his master, he never assumed the name of king. However, he governed Valencia with the authority of a sovereign; receiving ambassadors and being treated with respect by all nations. Of all those who have risen by their courage without aiming at usurpation, there never was one who acquired so much power and reputation as the Cid. After his death, which happened in the year 1096, the kings of Castile and Arragon constantly continued at war with the Moors, and Spain was never more drenched in blood, or rendered more desolate: the melancholy effects of the ancient conspiracy between the bishop of Opas and count Julian, which had lasted four hundred years, and continued long after to involve Spain in the most dreadful calamities.

It was from the middle to the latter end of the eleventh century, that the Cid rendered himself so famous in Europe. This was the brilliant age of chivalry, but at the same time was the æra of the insolent attempts of Gregory VII. of the misfortunes of Germany and Italy, and of the first crusade.

C H A P. XLV.

Of Religion and Superstition in the tenth and eleventh Centuries.

HERESIES seem to be the fruit of leisure and a little learning. We have seen that the state of the church in the tenth century scarcely permitted

either

either leisure or study: the whole world was in arms, and all the dispute was for riches. In the reign of King Robert however, there were certain priests in France, and amongst others, one named Stephen, confessor to queen Constantia, who were accused of heresy. These, that they might have an odious name, were called Manicheans; for neither they nor their judges could be acquainted with the doctrine of the Persian philosopher Manes. They were probably enthusiasts, who, in order to gain upon the minds of the people, affected an extraordinary sanctity; for this is the character of the chiefs of all sects. Horrid crimes, and unnatural sentiments, were imputed to them; the ordinary method of treating those whose doctrines are not sufficiently known and understood. They were juridically accused of reciting litanies in honour of devils, with afterwards extinguishing the lights, cohabiting together, and of burning the children produced from these impure mixtures, in order to swallow their ashes. These are nearly similar to the reproaches cast upon the first Christians. I suspect that this calumny, raised against them by the Pagans, had no other foundation than the form of the bread which the Christians used at the holy supper, and which was made in the shape of a little child, in order to represent the body of Jesus Christ, as is still practised in some of the Greek churches. The heretics I have been mentioning were accused particularly of teaching that God did not really come upon the earth, that he could not be born of a virgin, that he neither died nor rose again, and if so, they were not Christians. I find that accusations of this sort always contradict themselves.

They who were called Manicheans, and they who were afterwards named Albigenes, Vandois, and Lollards, and who appeared so often under different names, were remnants of the first Gaulish Christians, who were attached to several ancient customs, which the church of Rome thought proper to alter afterwards, and to certain vague opinions which that church adopted in process of time: for example, these primitive Christians

knew

knew nothing of image worship. They had never been enjoined auricular confession. We must not suppose that in the reign of Clovis, or before his time, the inhabitants of the Alps were adepts in transubstantiation and other dogmas of the church. In the eighth century, Claude, archbishop of Turin, adopted most of those opinions which at present constitute what is called the Protestant religion, and pretended that they were those of the primitive church. There is almost always a small flock separated from the principal one; and from the beginning of the eleventh century, this small flock was butchered or dispersed whenever it attempted to shew its head.

King Robert, and his wife Constantia, removed to Orleans, where some meetings of those called Manicheans were held; when the bishops caused thirteen of these unhappy persons to be burnt, and the king and queen assisted at this spectacle, so unworthy of their majesties. Never before this execution was any person put to death in France for preaching what they did not understand. It is true, that in the fourth century Priscillian, with seven of his followers, was condemned to Triers: but this city, which was then in Gaul, was not annexed to France since the declension of the family of Charlemagne. It is worthy of observation, that St. Martin of Tours would not communicate with the bishops, who had sought the blood of Priscillian; and loudly declared that it was an horrible action to condemn men to death because they were mistaken. There was no St. Martin to be found in the time of king Robert.

About the same time some slight clouds arose concerning the eucharist, but without bursting into a storm. This matter which, instead of being a subject of dispute, ought to have been only an object of silent adoration, had escaped the warm imagination of the Greek Christians. It was probably neglected, from its giving no scope to the metaphysics cultivated by the Greek doctors, since they adopted the ideas of Plato. They had found the means of making use of this philosophy

in the
tial
two v
but
chang
seque
this f
questi
losoph
Thus,
conter
ing;
munic
having
this m
It a
Engla
the bo
tant in
tenth
" by
" not
" Jesu
" enti
" and
" we
" nor
" spiri
John
from I

* Th
who affe
a Scotch
in a very
at the co
professor
the Grea
was mur
Hist. Lit
VOL.

in the explanation of the Trinity, in the consubstantiality of the Word, in the union of two natures and two wills, and, in short, in the abyss of predestination: but the questions, Whether the bread and wine were changed into the second person of the Trinity, and consequently into God? and, Whether we eat and drink this second person in reality or by faith alone? These questions, I say, were of another kind, which the philosophy of those times was incapable of answering. Thus, in the first ages of Christianity, people were contented with eating the Lord's supper in the evening; and in the time I am speaking of, with communicating at the mass under both species, without having any fixed and determinate ideas in relation to this mystery.

It appears that in many churches, and particularly in England, they believed that they only eat and drank the body and blood of Christ spiritually. There is extant in the Bodleian library a homily, written in the tenth century, in which are these words: "It is truly, " by consecration, the body and blood of Jesus Christ, " not corporally, but spiritually. The body in which " Jesus Christ suffered; and the eucharistical body, are " entirely different. The first was composed of flesh " and bones, animated by a rational soul; but what " we call the eucharist, has neither blood, nor bones, " nor soul. We ought then to understand it in a " spiritual sense."

John Scotus, surnamed Erigena, because he came from Ireland*, had long before this, in the reign of

* This is by no means certain; for there are some writers who assert that he was an Englishman, and others that he was a Scotchman, and born at Aire. He was a man of great learning in a very barbarous age. After having spent many years in France at the court of Charles the Bald, he returned to England, and was professor of geometry and astronomy at Oxford, under Alfred the Great, but removed from thence to Malmesbury, where he was murdered by his scholars, about the year 883. See *Cave's Hist. Literar.* Tom. ii. p. 45. T.

Charles the Bald, and even, as it is said, by that emperor's order, maintained the same opinion.

In the time of John Scotus, Ratram, a monk of Corby, and others, had written on this mystery in such a manner, as at least to leave room to doubt, whether they believed what has since been called the *real presence*; for Ratram, in his works addressed to the emperor Charles the Bald, says in express terms: "It is the body of Jesus Christ that is seen, received, and eaten; not indeed by the bodily senses, but by the eyes of the minds of the faithful." He then adds, "There is evidently no change either in the bread or in the wine, and therefore they must be the same they were at first;" and then, after quoting the authority of St. Augustine, he concludes with saying, "That the bread which is called the body, and the wine which is called the blood, are emblems, because the whole is a mystery."

In whatever manner Ratram himself, or others, might understand this, they wrote against him. And much about the same time another Benedictine monk, named Pascasius Rathbert, passed for the first person who had explained the general opinion in express terms, by saying, "That the body was the real body, which was brought forth by the Virgin, and the wine mixed with the water the real blood which flowed from his side, absolutely and not figuratively." This dispute gave rise to the sect of the Stercorists, or Stercoranists, who had the boldness to examine physically an object of faith, and pretended that the consecrated aliments must undergo digestion, and be evacuated again like common aliments.

As these disputes were all carried on in Latin, and the laity of those days were wholly employed in war, and seldom took part in scholastic disputes, they happily produced no bad effects. The common people had only a vague and obscure idea of those sacred mysteries. The vulgar in all ages have received their articles of faith as they do their money, without being at the pains to weigh or examine it.

At

At
about
pulpit
canno
He
eaten
bodily
drank
that t
white
round,
body t
time.
offensi
had co
disting
native
to Fra
equal
made
Domini
It m
"Lor
"brou
"same
"of r
"speci
"as to
"the f
This
been th
merely
an artic
sidered
of this
fore to
his reaso
had don
in 1050
to pron

At length Berenger, archdeacon of Angers, taught, about the year 1050, both by his writings and in the pulpit, that the true body of Jesus Christ is not, nor cannot be in the bread and wine.

He affirmed, that what would cause an indigestion, if eaten in too great a quantity, could be nothing but bodily food; that what would cause intoxication, if drank in too large a quantity, was a real liquor; that there was no such thing as whiteness without a white object, no roundness without a substance that was round, and that it was physically impossible for the same body to be in a thousand different places at the same time. These propositions were then so much the more offensive, as Berenger, having a very great reputation, had consequently many enemies. The person who distinguished himself most against him was Lanfranc, a native of Lombardy, born at Pavia, who was come to France to seek his fortune; and his reputation was equal to that of Berenger. This is the method he made use of to confound him, in his treatise *De Corpore Domini*:

It may with truth be said "that the body of our Lord in the eucharist, is the same as that which was brought forth by the Virgin, and that it is not the same: it is the same, as to the essence and properties of real nature; and it is not the same, as to the species of bread and wine; so that it is the same as to the substance, and it is not the same as to the form."

This opinion of Lanfranc's seems in general to have been that of the whole church. Berenger had reasoned merely as a philosopher; but the point in question was an article of faith, a mystery which the church considered as incomprehensible. Berenger was a member of this church; he was paid by it, and ought therefore to have had the same belief, and to have submitted his reason in the same manner as the rest of his brethren had done. He was condemned at the council of Paris in 1050, as also at Rome in 1079; and he was obliged to pronounce his recantation; but this being forced, only

served to impress those sentiments more deeply in his heart; he therefore died in the same opinion, which at that time caused neither a schism, nor a civil war. Temporalities alone were the grand objects that excited the ambition of mankind. The other source that was to occasion the shedding of so much blood, was not yet opened.

It was after the dispute and condemnation of Berenger, that the church instituted the ceremony of elevating the host, that the people, in adoring it, might no longer doubt of its reality, which had been so warmly disputed. But the term transubstantiation was not yet annexed to this mystery, nor was it adopted till the year 1215 in a council held at Lateran. The opinion of Scotus, Ratram, and Berenger was not entirely buried, but was preserved by several ecclesiastics, and transmitted to the Vaudois, the Albigenses, the Hussites, and the Protestants, as we shall see hereafter.

You may have observed, that in all the disputes which have animated the Christians against each other since the first rise of the church, the see of Rome has always decided in favour of that opinion which tended the most to degrade the human understanding, and obscure the light of reason. I here speak only as an historian; I set aside the inspiration and infallibility of the church, which make no part of history. It is certain, that in making marriage a sacrament, they rendered conjugal fidelity a greater virtue, and adultery a more heinous crime; and that by inculcating the belief of the real presence of God in the eucharist, which was taken into the mouth and the stomach of the communicant, they filled his mind with religious awe. What reverence was not due to those, who, by a few words, were able to change common bread into the divine nature, and especially to the chief of a religion, that could operate such a prodigy? When human reason, left to itself, began to examine these mysteries, it lessened the object of former veneration; and the multiplicity of priests, by rendering this miracle

racle
the p
An
to be
the p
from
living
piety
Th
hell,
clear
book
of th

Th
fessor
believ
Provi
conde
next
Ca
story
monst
Jerusa
where
the is
bourh
into v
and t
howli
their
they,
almost
Th
the fe
institu
huma

racle too common, made it at length less respected by the people.

And here we must not omit the custom which began to be introduced in the eleventh century, of buying off the punishments of the dead, and delivering their souls from purgatory by the alms and the prayers of the living, and establishing a solemn festival for this act of piety.

The opinion of a purgatory, as well as that of an hell, is of the highest antiquity; but it is no where so clearly expressed as in the following passage of the sixth book of Virgil's *Æneid*, in which we meet with most of the mysteries of the religion of the Gentiles.

*Ergo exercentur pœnis, veterumque malorum
Supplicia expendunt, &c.*

This notion was by degrees sanctified by the professors of Christianity, and they carried it so far as to believe that they might by prayer soften the decrees of Providence, and obtain of God the pardon of a soul condemned to undergo a temporary punishment in the next life.

Cardinal Peter Damien, the same who relates the story of King Robert's queen being delivered of a monster, tells us, that a pilgrim, in his return from Jerusalem, was cast by a tempest on a desert island, where he found a venerable hermit, who told him, that the island was inhabited by devils, and that the neighbourhood of his cave was entirely covered with flames, into which the devils used to cast the souls of the dead; and that these same devils were incessantly crying and howling against St. Odilon, abbot of Cluni, who was their mortal enemy. The prayers of this Odilon, said they, and those of his monks, rob us of some soul almost every day.

This adventure being related to Odilon, he instituted the festival of All Souls in his convent at Cluni. This institution was certainly founded on the principles of humanity and piety; and these may in some measure

serve as an excuse for the fable of the pilgrim. The church soon adopted this solemnity, and made it an obligatory one. Great indulgences were annexed to those who offered up prayers for the dead; and if it had stopt there, it would have been an act of devotion, but it soon degenerated into an abuse. These indulgences were sold at an extravagant price, and the mendicant friars in particular made people pay for taking the souls of their friends out of purgatory. They talked of nothing but the apparitions of departed sinners and complaining souls, who came to implore assistance; and they did not fail to relate the sudden deaths and the eternal sufferings of those who had refused to perform this duty. In a word, fraud and extortion succeeded to pious credulity, and this was one of the reasons which in process of time lost the church of Rome one half of Europe.

We may reasonably suppose that the ignorance of these ages strengthened the popular superstitions; I will relate some few instances which for a long time imposed on the credulity of mankind.

It is pretended, that the emperor Otho III. put Mary of Arragon, his wife, to death on account of adultery; and it is very possible, that a cruel and bigoted prince, such as Otho III. is painted, might punish with death a wife less debauched than himself. But twenty authors have written, and Maimbourg has repeated after them, and others have repeated after Maimbourg, that the empress having made some advances to a young Italian count, who refused her from a principle of virtue, she accused him to the emperor of having attempted to seduce her, and he was punished with death. After his execution, his widow came with her husband's head in her hand, to demand justice, and to prove his innocence; the widow insisted on being put to the trial of hot iron, and held in her hand an iron bar red hot, so long as was desired, without being burnt: this prodigy serving as a legal proof, the empress was condemned to be burnt alive.

Maimbourg

Maimbourg should have considered that this fable is related only by authors who wrote long after the reign of Otho III. and that they do not give the names of the Italian count, or of the widow who handled a bar of red hot iron without being hurt: it is even very doubtful whether there was ever any such person as a Mary of Arragon, wife of Otho III. In short, though even cotemporary authors should attempt to give authentic accounts of such events, they would not deserve greater credit than the wizards who depose before a court of justice, that they have assisted at the nocturnal meetings of witches.

The adventure of the iron bar ought to discredit the punishment of the pretended empress Mary of Arragon, related in so many dictionaries and histories, in every page of which there is a mixture of falsehood and truth.

The second event is of the same kind. It is pretended that Henry II. successor to Otho III. tried the fidelity of his wife Cunigunda, by making her walk barefooted over nine red hot plow-shares. This history, related in such a number of martyrologies, deserves the same answer as that of the wife of Otho.

Desiderius, abbot of Mount Cassino, and many other writers, relate a fact nearly of the same kind. In the year 1063, the monks of Florence, dissatisfied with their bishop, went through the city and country, crying, "Our bishop is guilty of simony, and is a villain." And they were bold enough, we are told, to engage to prove the accusation by the trial of fire. The first Wednesday in Lent was therefore appointed for the ceremony. Two piles of wood were prepared, each ten feet in length and five in breadth, separated by a path a foot and a half broad, filled with dry wood. The two piles being lighted, and the wood in this space reduced to coals, a monk, called Peter Aldobrandin, passed through this path with a grave and solemn pace, and even returned half way back to take from the midst of the flames his maniple, which he had let fall. This has been related by many historians, and cannot be

be denied without overturning the very foundations of history ; but it is certain, that we cannot give credit to it without overturning the very foundation of reason.

It is without doubt possible that a man may pass very rapidly between two burning piles of wood, and even on hot embers, without being intirely burnt ; but his passing and repassing with a grave step to take up his maniple, is one of those adventures of the golden legends, which ought no longer to be mentioned to men of sense.

The last proof I shall relate, is that which was adopted in Spain after the taking of Toledo, to determine whether they ought to repeat the Roman office, or that called Mosarabic. It was at first unanimously agreed to terminate the dispute by a duel : two champions, armed cap-a-pee, fought according to all the rules of chivalry ; when Don Ruis de Martanza, knight of the Mosarabic missal, threw his adversary out of his saddle and brought him to the ground in a dying state. But the queen, who had a great inclination for the Roman missal, resolved that they should make the trial of fire. All the laws of chivalry were against it ; however, the two mass-books were thrown into the flames, and were probably burnt ; when the king, to please every body, gave orders that in some churches the Roman ritual should be adopted ; and in others, the Mosarabic.

The solemnity of religion was disfigured throughout every part of the West by the most ridiculous customs. The festival of fools, and that of asses, were established in most churches. On certain days they created a bishop of fools ; and an ass was led into the body of the church, dressed in a cope and a four cornered cap. The ass was revered in commemoration of that which carried Jesus Christ.

Dances in the church, feastings on the altar, revelry and obscene farces, were the ceremonies observed on those festivals ; and these ridiculous customs continued to be adopted during about seven centuries in many dioceses. If we were to consider only the usages here related,

rela
of ne
in m
Ro
as we
rites
and t
decor
it wa
perly
other

Of the
gory
tury.
unba
gory

IT is
to
began t
It wa
or what
perors
western
German
and bish
princes,
a new p
spired th
The pop
aiming a
The
the pope
that the
a sudden
Vol. I

related, we should imagine we were reading an account of negroes or Hottentots; and it must be confessed that in many things we were by no means superior to them.

Rome had often condemned these barbarous customs, as well as duels and ordeals. There was always in the rites of that church, notwithstanding its civil troubles and the scandalous lives of many of its popes, more decorum and gravity than in those of other sees, and it was acknowledged, that Rome, when free and properly governed, was formed to give lessons to all the other churches.

C H A P. XLVI.

Of the Empire, Italy, the Emperor Henry IV. and Gregory VII. Of Rome and the Empire in the eleventh Century. Of the Donation of the Countess Matilda. Of the unhappy End of the Emperor Henry IV. and Pope Gregory VII.

IT is now time to return to the ruins of Rome, and to the shadow of the throne of the Cæsars, which began to be revived in Germany.

It was not as yet determined who was to reign in Rome, or what was to be the fate of Italy. The German emperors looked upon themselves as sovereigns of the western world. But they were hardly sovereigns in Germany, where the grand feudal government of lords and bishops began to take deep root. The Norman princes, who had conquered Apulia and Calabria, formed a new power. The example of the Venetians had inspired the great cities of Italy with the love of liberty. The popes were not sovereigns as yet, but they were aiming at sovereignty.

The right claimed by the emperors of nominating the popes, began to be established; but it is easy to see, that the first favourable circumstance must have given a sudden turn to affairs. Such a circumstance soon took

place under the minority of the emperor Henry IV. who in the life-time of his father Henry III. had been
1056 acknowledged his successor.

Even so early as the reign of Henry III. the imperial authority began to decline in Italy. His sister, the countess or duchess of Tuscany, mother of the great benefactress of the popes, the countess Matilda of Este, was the person who chiefly contributed to excite all Italy against her brother. Besides the marquisate of Mantua, she possessed Tuscany and a part of Lombardy; but having been so imprudent as to venture on a visit to the court of Germany, she was there confined for a long time as a prisoner. Her daughter, the countess Matilda, inherited her ambition, together with her aversion to the imperial family.

During the minority of Henry IV. several popes owed their election to intrigues, to money, and to civil dissensions. At length, in 1061, Alexander II. was chosen pope, without consulting the imperial court. In vain did that court nominate another pope; their interest was then upon the decline in Italy. Alexander II. carried his point, and his competitor was driven out of Rome.

When Henry IV. came of age, he saw himself emperor of Italy and Germany, but hardly possessed of any power. Part of the secular and ecclesiastical princes of his own country had conspired against him; and it is plain that he could not be master of Italy but at the head of an army, which he wanted. His power was inconsiderable, but his courage was superior to his fortune.

1073 Some authors relate, that being accused at the diet of Wurtzburg of an intention to assassinate the dukes of Swabia and Carinthia, he offered to fight the accuser, who was only a private gentleman. The day was fixed for the combat, but the accuser not appearing, the emperor was acquitted.

As soon as the authority of a prince is contested, it is usual to attack his morals. He was publicly accused of having mistresses, while the clergy of every rank
indulged

indulged themselves in the same manner with impunity. He wanted to be divorced from his wife, a daughter of the marquis de Ferrara, with whom he said he had never been able to consummate his marriage. The follies of his youth had likewise alienated the minds of the people, and his conduct had weakened his power.

There resided at that time at Rome a monk of the order of Cluny, lately created cardinal; a man of a restless, fiery, and enterprising disposition, who knew how to join artifice and cunning to a furious zeal for the pretensions of the church. Hildebrand was the name of this daring man, who was afterwards the celebrated Gregory VII. He was born at Soana in Tuscany, of obscure parents, and brought up at Rome; and having been admitted a monk of Cluny under the abbot Odilo, and deputed afterwards to negotiate the affairs of his order at Rome, had been employed by the popes in all those political concerns that require dexterity and resolution: he was already celebrated throughout Italy for his zeal and intrepidity. The public expected he would succeed to Alexander II. as he had had the administration of affairs under that pontificate. All that the malice or flattery of a multitude of writers have said of this pope, is concentrated in a portrait drawn by a Neapolitan artist, where Gregory is represented holding a crook in one hand, and a whip in the other, trampling sceptres under his feet, with St. Peter's net and fishes on each side of him.

Gregory prevailed on Alexander II. to take a bold and very extraordinary step in summoning the young emperor Henry to appear at Rome before the tribunal of the holy see. This is the first instance of such an enterprize. And at what time did the pope venture to engage in it? When Rome had been accustomed by Henry III. father of Henry IV. to receive her bishops upon a simple order from the emperor. This was the very yoke which Gregory wanted to shake off: to prevent the emperor from giving laws to Rome, he said would have the pope superior to the emperor. This daring step was attended with no bad consequence at

that time. Alexander seemed to be a kind of forlorn hope, sent by Hildebrand against the empire, before he gave battle; for this first act of hostility was soon followed by the death of Alexander.

Hildebrand had interest to procure himself to be elected and installed by the people of Rome, without waiting for the emperor's permission; but he soon obtained this permission, upon promising fealty and allegiance. Henry accepted of his excuses, and his chancellor of Italy repaired to Rome to confirm the election. Upon this occasion Henry, whom his courtiers advised to beware of Gregory, publicly declared, that this pope could never be ungrateful to his benefactor. But Gregory was scarce settled on the papal throne, when he pronounced excommunication against all those who received benefices from the hands of laymen, and against every layman that conferred them. He had conceived a design of depriving all secular patrons of the right of presentation to church livings; which indeed was setting the church at open variance with the sovereigns of all nations. His violent temper broke out at the same time against Philip I. king of France. The dispute originated concerning some Italian merchants, of whom the French had extorted money. The pope wrote a circular letter to the bishops of France, in which he has the following expressions: "Your king is rather a tyrant than a king; he spends his days in infamy and vice;" and after these indiscreet words, follows the ordinary menace of excommunication.

- 1075 Not long after, while Henry was engaged in a civil war against the Saxons, the pope sent two legates to him, with a summons to come and answer to the charge of having granted the investiture of benefices, and threatening to excommunicate him in case he refused to comply. The two messengers, who brought this strange summons, delivered their message to the emperor just after he had obtained a complete victory over the Saxons, when he was crowned with glory, and grown more powerful than they expected. It is easy to con-

ceive

ceive
twen
have
exem
times
treat
indisc
attenc

Ab
the M
have
excom
to be
that v
he ad
king'
that v
Italy
Rome
Norm
condu
daring
that
other
churc
conne
oblig
off al
bring
to the
and it
himse
crown

He
to be
vengi
Germ
an ar
name
who

ceive with what disdain a young emperor of five-and-twenty, victorious, and jealous of his dignity, must have received this message; yet he did not inflict any exemplary punishment upon them, the prejudices of the times not allowing of such a step; all he did, was to treat this audacity with contempt, and to abandon these indiscreet legates to the contumelies of the servants attending his court. 1076

About the same time the pope excommunicated also the Norman princes of Apulia and Calabria, as we have already mentioned in a former chapter. So many excommunications at once, would in our days appear to be the effect of madness; but we are to observe, that when Gregory VII. menaced the king of France, he addressed his bull to the duke of Aquitaine, the king's vassal, who was as powerful as the king himself; that when he threatened the emperor, he had a part of Italy on his side, together with the countess Matilda, Rome, and one half of Germany; that in regard to the Normans, they were his avowed enemies; and then the conduct of Gregory VII. will appear rather violent and daring, than weak and extravagant. He was sensible, that in raising his dignity above the emperor, and all other princes, he would be seconded by the rest of the churches, who would be flattered to see themselves connected with a chief to whom the secular powers were obliged to submit. His scheme was not only to throw off all dependency on the emperors, but moreover to bring Rome, the emperors, and kings, into subjection to the papacy. The attempt might cost him his life, and it was what he ought to expect; but he flattered himself, that at least the peril of the enterprize would crown his memory with glory.

Henry IV. who was too much engaged in Germany, to be able to march into Italy, seemed to aim at revenging himself rather as an Italian lord, than as a German emperor. Instead of employing a general and an army, he is said to have made use of a ruffian, named Cencius, who was famous for his robberies, and who seized upon the pope in the church of St. Mary Major,

Major, at the very time he was celebrating divine service. The desperate villains that were with him, struck the pontiff, and gave him several wounds: from thence they hurried him away, and confined him in a tower, of which Cencius had got possession.

1076 Henry acted a little more in the character of a prince, in calling a council of bishops, abbots and doctors, at Worms, in which he caused the pope to be deposed; and the sentence was agreed to by the votes of the whole assembly, two only excepted. But this council wanted troops to make its decisions properly respected at Rome. Henry only weakened his authority, by writing to the pope that he deposed him, and to the people of Rome, that he forbade them to acknowledge Gregory as their bishop.

1076 The pope had no sooner received these letters, than he assembled a council at Rome, in which he expressed himself in these words: "In the name of the Almighty God, and by virtue of my authority, I prohibit Henry, the son of our emperor Henry, from governing the Teutonic kingdom and Italy. I release all Christians from their oath of allegiance to him; and I strictly charge every person whomsoever never to serve, or attend him as king." It is well known, that this is the first instance of a pope's pretending to deprive a sovereign of his crown. In a former part of this Essay, we saw Louis the Debonnair deposed by his bishops, but there was at least some colour for that step. They condemned Louis, in appearance, only to a public penance; but nobody, since the establishment of the church, had presumed to speak in the same style as Gregory. We find the pope, in his circular letters, breathing the same spirit as in his excommunicatory sentence; for he repeats several times, "That bishops are superior to kings, and made to judge them;" expressions equally artful and presumptuous, as they were likely to make the prelates in all parts of the world his friends.

It is probable, that when Gregory VII. thus deposed his sovereign, only by pronouncing a few words, he depended

depend
favour
revive
been in
was p
sudden
had de
in dep
This re
not fai
longer
himself
derates
distress
a nat
Each C
as in
The fir
thunde

The
on con
commu
any Ch
preside
by who

It w
of elec
him;
in reali
both o
triumph
reduce
lemnity

In
burgh,
Alps o
absolut
the co
cient
Reggio

depended on the diversion which would be made in his favour by the civil wars in Germany, which began to revive with the utmost fury. A bishop of Utrecht had been instrumental in the pope's condemnation; and it was pretended that this bishop being seized with a sudden and painful illness which deprived him of life, had declared his repentance for having been concerned in deposing the pope, deeming it a sacrilegious act. This remorse of the bishop, whether true or false, did not fail to influence the people. Germany was no longer united under the Othos; and Henry IV. saw himself surrounded at Spire by the army of the confederates, who availed themselves of the pope's bull to distress their sovereign. Revolutions of this kind were a natural consequence of the feudal government. Each German prince was jealous of the imperial power, as in France the great lords were jealous of their king. The fire of civil war still lay concealed, and the timely thundering of a bull might easily rekindle it.

The confederate princes granted Henry his liberty, on condition that he should live as a private and excommunicated person, at Spire, without performing any Christian or regal function, till the pope came to preside at Augsburg at a diet of princes and bishops, by whom he was to be solemnly tried.

It would seem as if those princes, who had a right of electing the emperor, had also a right to depose him; but to make the pope preside at this trial, was in reality acknowledging him to be the supreme judge both of the emperor and the empire. This was the triumph of Gregory and the papacy; and Henry, reduced to these extremities added greatly to its solemnity.

In order to prevent this fatal judgment of Augs-
burgh, he formed a sudden resolution of passing the
Alps of Tyrol with a few domestics, and going to ask
absolution of the pope. Gregory VII. was then with
the countess Matilda, in the town of Canosa, the an-
cient Canusium, on the Apennine mountains, near
Reggio, a fortress which in those times was held to be
impregnable.

impregnable. The emperor, who had been celebrated for his victories, came to the gates of this fortress without either guards or attendants. As soon as he had passed the first inclosure, he was stopped, stripped of all his cloaths and clad with a hair cloth. He was then obliged to wait barefooted for some time in the
 1077 court-yard, though it was in the month of January: afterwards they made him fast three days, without admitting him to kiss the pope's feet, who, during this whole time, had shut himself up with the countess Matilda, whose spiritual director he had been for some time. It is by no means wonderful that the enemies of this pope should have censured his conduct in regard to that princess: it is true, that he was then sixty years old; but still he was a spiritual director, and Matilda was a woman, young and weak like the rest of her sex. The devout language which we find in the pope's letters to this princess, compared with the extravagance of his ambition, might lead us to suspect that he made use of religion as a cloak to all his passions. However, it must be acknowledged, that there is not a single fact or circumstance to confirm these suspicions. Voluptuous hypocrites have neither such constancy in their enthusiasm, nor such intrepidity in their zeal. Gregory was austere, and this was the very thing that made him dangerous.

At length the emperor was permitted to throw himself at the pontiff's feet, who consented indeed to absolve him, but at the same time made him swear that he would wait for the papal sentence at the diet of Augsburg, and in every respect submit himself to it. Several other bishops and German lords of the emperor's party, made the same submission. Gregory VII. then considering himself, and indeed not without reason, as the lord and master of all the crowned heads of the earth, said in several of his letters, that it was his duty to pull down the pride of kings.

The people of Lombardy, who still held out for the emperor, were so provoked at this mean submission, that they were very near deserting him. Gregory how-
 ever

ever
 Germ
 outrag
 indign
 viour
 disposi
 fortun
 power
 All L
 Grego
 On
 vail o
 Henry
 anothe
 dolphu
 he wou
 and be
 most fu
 confide
 happen
 the pop
 the seco
 " said
 " Rod
 that he
 a preser
 which v

This
 and the
 In th
 itself in
 hair-clo
 mercy o
 took tw
 one to d
 his comp
 bishops
 VOL. I

ever was more hated in this part of Italy, than in Germany; and luckily for Henry, their aversion to the outrages committed by the pope, prevailed over the indignation they had conceived at the mean behaviour of their prince. He made a proper use of this disposition of the people, and by a strange reverse of fortune in a German emperor, he found himself very powerful in Italy, while he was deserted in Germany. All Lombardy was up in arms against the pope, and Gregory was raising all Germany against the emperor.

On the one side, the pope acted under hand to prevail on the Germans to elect another emperor, and Henry used every endeavour to make the Italians chuse another pope. Accordingly, the Germans chose Rodolphus duke of Swabia; and Gregory wrote word, that ¹⁰⁷⁸ he would determine between Henry and Rodolphus, and bestow the imperial crown on him who would be most submissive to the Roman see. Henry put more confidence in his troops, than in the holy father, but happened to meet with some ill success; upon which the pope grew more haughty, and excommunicated him the second time in 1080. "I deprive him of his crown," said he, and give away the kingdom of Germany to "Rodolphus." And in order to make people believe that he was really the bestower of empires, he made a present to this Rodolphus of a crown of gold, on which was engraved this verse:

Petra dedit Petro, Petrus diadema Rodolpho.

This miserable pun shews the taste of those times, and the haughtiness of the Roman pontiff.

In the mean time, Henry's party began to recover itself in Germany; and this very prince, who, clad in hair-cloth and barefooted, had waited three days at the mercy of a person, whom he considered as his subject, took two courageous resolutions upon this occasion; one to depose the pope, and the other to give battle to ¹⁰⁸⁰ his competitor. Accordingly he assembled about twenty bishops at Brixen in the county of Tyrol, who, with

the concurrence of the prelates of Lombardy, excommunicated and deposed Gregory VII. as an encourager of tyrants, and one that was guilty of simony, sacrilege, and magic. They then elected Guibert, archbishop of Ravenna, to the dignity of pope. While this new pontiff was hastening to Lombardy, in order to excite the people against Gregory; Henry marched, at the head of an army, against his rival Rodolphus. Was it excess of enthusiasm, or what we call a pious fraud, that induced Gregory to predict that Henry would be vanquished and slain in the course of this war? "May I be no longer pope," says he in a letter to the German bishops of his party, "if this does not happen before St. Peter's day." Sound reason tells us, that whoever pretends to foretel future events, is either a knave or a fool. But let us consider the reigning prejudices of those days. Judicial astrology was ever the superstition of the learned: and Gregory is accused of having listened to astrologers. In the act of his deposition at Brixen, it is mentioned, that he concerned himself in the interpreting of dreams; and it was on this foundation that they accused him of magic. He was treated as an impostor because of this false and strange prediction; when perhaps his only guilt was his being too credulous.

His prediction fell out upon his own creature Rodolphus, who met with a complete overthrow. Godfrey 1080 of Bouillon, nephew of the countess Matilda, the same who afterwards made the conquest of Jerusalem, slew this emperor whom the pope was so proud of having elected. Who would imagine that Gregory, on the news of this event, instead of courting Henry, should write to all the bishops of Germany, that they must proceed to the election of another sovereign, on condition of his yielding homage to the pope as his vassal? These letters sufficiently prove that there was still a powerful party against Henry in Germany.

It was at this very time, that the pope ordered his legates in France to demand a yearly tribute of a silver denier for every house, as was the practice in England.

He

He
preter
dom;
" bet
" yiel

He
count
tianity
" tha
" of l

Ent
pear t
times.
those
the ch
since t

His
some
the co
auther
servin
not kn
this d
away
upon
tic: a
lands

The
confir
Henry
ever se
a subj
in pos
centia
duchy
now c
Orvie

He
yet th
Matil

He treated Spain in a more despotic manner; for he pretended to be the lord paramount of the whole kingdom; and in his sixth letter he says, "That it is much better it should belong to the Saracens, than not to yield homage to the holy see."

He wrote thus to Salomon, king of Hungary, a country which at that time had hardly embraced Christianity. "The elders of your nation will inform you, that the kingdom of Hungary belongs to the church of Rome."

Enterprizes of this kind, how rash soever they may appear to us, are generally an effect of the prejudices of the times. Undoubtedly the ignorance which prevailed in those days, made a multitude of people believe, that the church was the absolute mistress of all kingdoms; since the pope constantly wrote in this style.

His inflexibility in regard to Henry was not without some cause; for he had gained such an ascendancy over the countess Matilda, as to persuade her to make an authentic donation of her territories to the holy see, reserving to herself only the usufruct during life. It is not known, whether there was a public instrument of this donation. It was the custom for those who gave away their lands to the church, to put a lump of earth upon the altar. Witnesses rendered the deed authentic: and Matilda is said to have given away all her lands twice to the holy see.

The truth of this donation, which was afterwards confirmed by her will, was not in the least disputed by Henry IV. This is the most authentic title that was ever set up by the popes: and yet this very title proved a subject of fresh quarrels. The countess Matilda was in possession of Tuscany, Mantua, Parma, Reggio, Placentia, Ferrara, Modena, part of Umbria, and the duchy of Spoleto, with Verona, and almost all that is now called the patrimony of St. Peter, from Viterbo to Orvieto, and part of the marquisate of Ancona.

Henry III. had granted this marquisate to the popes; yet this grant did not hinder the mother of the countess Matilda from putting herself into possession of towns,

which she considered as her property. It would seem as if Matilda wanted to repair after her mother's decease, the injury she had done the holy see when living. But she could not give away fiefs that were unalienable; and the emperors pretended that her whole patrimony was a fief of the empire. She was making a grant of lands that were first to be conquered; which was entailing war on those who reaped her inheritance. Henry IV. as next heir and lord paramount, considered this donation as an infringement of the rights of the empire; yet after a long struggle he was obliged to give up a part of those dominions to the holy see.

1081 Henry, breathing revenge, came at length and laid siege to Rome, and soon made himself master of that part of the town on this side the Tiber, which is called the Leonina. He negotiated with the citizens, while he menaced the pope, and contrived to bribe over to his party the principal inhabitants of Rome. The people, throwing themselves at the feet of their pontiff, intreated him to avert the miseries of a siege, and submit to the emperor. The intrepid Gregory replied, "That the emperor must again do penance, if he expected to receive absolution."

In the mean-time however the siege was lengthened out. But Henry, who had sometimes been present at it in person, and sometimes been obliged to quit it in order to quell a revolt in Germany, at length carried the city by storm. It is surprizing, that the German emperors should have so often made themselves masters of Rome, and yet never resided there. But Gregory VII. was not yet taken: he retired into the castle of St. Angelo, and from thence defied and excommunicated the emperor.

Rome was severely punished for the intrepidity of her pope. Robert Guiscard, duke of Apulia, one of the famous Normans, of whom I have already spoken, took the opportunity of the emperor's absence to come to the relief of the pontiff; but at the same time he plundered Rome, which was equally a prey to the Imperialists who besieged the pope, and to the Neapolitans

litans
after
him a
who i
and t
his in
aveng
in the
their c

The
marrie
of Gu
proved
see;
and sh
engag

The
flames
mit to
and in
it shou
peror
upon
who w
possess
reign
II. a
years.
emper

The
of the
did no
in Rom
give th
deposi
permi
crozier
bishop
owed t
their b

litans who set him free. Gregory VII. died some time after at Salerno, the 24th of May 1085, leaving behind him a memory dear and sacred to the Roman clergy, who inherited his pride, but detestable to the emperors, and to every good citizen who considers the effects of his inflexible ambition. The church, whose cause he avenged, and to whom he died a victim; has ranked him in the list of her saints, as the ancients used to place their defenders among the Gods.

The countess Matilda having lost pope Gregory, married soon afterwards the young prince Guelfe, son of Guelfe, duke of Bavaria. This step sufficiently proved the imprudence of her donation to the holy see; for she was only two and forty years of age, and she still might have had children, who must have engaged in a civil war to recover their inheritance.

The death of Gregory VII. did not extinguish the flames he had kindled. His successors would not submit to have their elections approved of by the emperor; and instead of yielding homage to others, they expected it should be paid to themselves: besides, if an emperor was excommunicated, he ceased to be looked upon as a human creature. An abbot of Mount Cassino, who was elected pope after the death of Gregory VII. possessed the same spirit as his predecessor, but his reign was of short duration; to him succeeded Urban II. a Frenchman of obscure birth, who reigned eleven years. Both these pontiffs were bitter enemies to the emperor.

There seems to be no doubt that the real foundation of the dispute was this: the popes and the Romans did not chuse that the emperors should have any power in Rome; and the pretext, to which they would fain give the sanction of religion, was that the popes, being depositaries of the rights of the church, could not permit profane princes to invest the bishops with the crozier and ring. There could be no doubt but the bishops, as subjects of princes, and enriched by them, owed them homage for the lands which they held by their benevolence. The emperors and kings did not pretend

pretend to give the Holy Ghost to those bishops, but they wanted them to swear fealty for the temporalities they had given them. The crozier and ring were accessories to the main question; but in this, as well as in the generality of disputes, they wrangled about an indifferent ceremony, whilst the essential points were neglected.

Henry IV. constantly excommunicated and persecuted under this pretence by every pope in his time, experienced all the miseries that religious and civil wars are capable of producing. Urban II. stirred up his own son Conrad against him; and after the death of this unnatural son, his brother, who was afterwards the emperor Henry V. made war against his father. This was the second time since Charlemagne that the popes were seen arming children against their parents.

1106 Henry IV. deceived by his son Henry, as Lewis the Debonnair had been by his, was confined in Mentz, where he was solemnly deposed by two of the pope's legates, whilst two deputies of the diet, sent by his son, stripped him of his crown, and other imperial ornaments.

Soon after this, we find him escaping out of prison, and wandering in a state of poverty and distress, without finding any relief. At length he died in Liege, in a more miserable condition than Gregory VII. and in still greater obscurity, after having so long engaged the attention of all Europe by his victories, his grandeur, his misfortunes, his vices, and his virtues. With his last breath he cried out, *Just God, thou wilt revenge this parricide.* Mankind in all ages have imagined that God gives ear to the curses of dying persons, and especially of parents: an error of some use and value, could it be a bar to villainy. Another error obtained more generally, that persons dying under excommunication were damned: the son of Henry IV. put the finishing stroke to his infamy, by affecting the barbarous piety of digging up the body of his father, which lay buried in the cathedral of Liege, and ordering it

it to be
comp

Let
exhun
IV. a
king
repeat
and o
many
heads
that
orders
the fo
on ac
many,
fore t
who
having
once
fanatic
fanatic
the ye
will n
that
which
more
event
will m
uneasy

Of the

H
rogati
he wa

it to be removed to a vault at Spire. Thus did he complete his unnatural hypocrisy.

Let us here pause for a moment to contemplate the exhumated corpse of this celebrated emperor Henry IV. a prince still more unfortunate than Henry IV. king of France. Let us examine whence came such repeated humiliations and misfortunes on the one hand; and on the other such a daring exertion of power, so many horrid actions reputed sacred, so many crowned heads made the victims of religion; and we shall find that the true cause of all these calamities and disorders was in the common people, who are always the foremost to arm the hands of superstition. It was on account of the miners and wood-cleavers of Germany, that the emperor had appeared barefooted before the bishop of Rome. It is the common people, who being slaves to superstition themselves, are for having their masters loaded with the same yoke. When once a prince suffers his subjects to be blinded by fanaticism, they will soon oblige him to appear as fanatic as themselves; and if he attempts to throw off the yoke which they are so fond of wearing, they will rebel against him. He may imagine, perhaps, that the more weighty he makes the chains of religion, which, by the bye, ought to be light and easy, the more submissive his people will be to him; but the event will convince him of his error, and his subjects will make use of those very chains to make his throne uneasy to him, or to drag him from it.

C H A P. XLVII.

Of the Emperor Henry V. and of Rome, to the Reign of Frederick I.

HENRY V. who had dethroned his father by the authority of the pope, maintained the same prerogatives as his father against the church, as soon as he was possessed of the sovereignty.

The

The popes had already learnt to shelter themselves against the emperors under the protection of the kings of France; it is true, the papal pretensions struck directly at the authority of all sovereigns, but they knew how to soften by treaties those whom they insulted by their bulls. The kings of France had no pretensions at Rome; they were likewise neighbours to Germany, and jealous of the emperors who affected to lord it over the kings; of course they were the natural allies of the popes. This induced Paschal II. to come into France to implore the assistance of king Philip; and his successors often followed his example. Neither the territories in the possession of the holy see, nor the rights it was perpetually claiming by virtue of the pretended donations of Pepin and Charlemagne, or the real donation of the countess Matilda, were as yet sufficient to render the pope a powerful prince. All these estates were either contested or possessed by others. The emperor maintained, and not without reason, that Matilda's lands ought to revert to him as a fief of the empire; and thus the popes were engaged both in a spiritual and temporal quarrel. All that Paschal II. could obtain of Philip II. was a permission to hold a council at Troyes; the government being then too weak, and too much divided, to assist him with troops.

Henry V. after a short war, having concluded a treaty with the Poles, prevailed on the princes of the empire to support his right, so that those very princes, who had helped to dethrone his father in virtue of the pope's bulls, joined with the son to cause those bulls to be annulled at Rome.

Henry passed the Alps with a powerful army, and Rome was once more a scene of blood for this quarrel about the cross and ring. Treaties, perjuries, excommunications and murders, succeeded each other with the greatest rapidity. Paschal II. having solemnly given up the point of investitures, by swearing upon the gospels, made the cardinals annul his oath; a new way of breaking his word. He suffered himself to be treated in full council as a coward and a prevaricator, in order to

to be o
empero
those C
of eccl
ceremo
created
and aft
father,
German
about t
ring.
signed t
of Fran
or of i
have th

It w
that ki
the cer
The de
emperor
absurd
decided
bishopri
meddle
a right
the pop
countess
pire? I
as fuel f

After
pire bei
on a p
rius II.
about t
though
had bee
cardinal
yet estab
in the g
able int
Vol.

to be obliged to resume what he had given away. The emperor then marched a second time to Rome; for those Cæsars hardly ever went thither but on the account of ecclesiastical disputes, the chief of which was the ceremony of the coronation. At length, after having created, deposed, banished and recalled several popes, and after having been as often excommunicated as his father, and like him disturbed by his great vassals in Germany, Henry V. was obliged to terminate the war about the investitures, by renouncing the crozier and the ring. He did more than this; for he solemnly re-¹¹²⁰ signed the right which the emperors as well as the kings of France had claimed, of nominating to bishoprics, or of interfering in such a manner at elections, as to have the absolute disposal of them.

It was then determined in a council held at Rome, that kings should no longer grant investitures, with the ceremony of a crooked staff, but with a ring. The decrees of this council were confirmed by the emperor in Germany, and thus ended this bloody and absurd war. But at the same time that the council decided so particularly the kind of staff, with which the bishoprics were to be granted, they took care not to meddle with the question, Whether the emperor had a right to confirm the election of a pope? or whether the pope was his vassal? or whether the estate of the countess Matilda belonged to the church, or to the empire? It would seem as if all these points were reserved as fuel for a new war.

After the death of Henry V. without issue, the em-¹¹²⁵ pire being still elective, was conferred by ten electors on a prince of the house of Saxony, named Lotharius II. There was much less intrigue and quarrel about the imperial throne than the papal chair; for though in a council held in 1059, by Nicholas II. it had been ordained that the pope should be elected by cardinal bishops, yet there was no set form or rule as yet established in these elections. This essential defect in the government, was the effect however of a respectable institution. The primitive Christians, who were

generally obscure people, and united together by the common dread of the magistrates, secretly governed their poor and holy society by a plurality of voices. But riches having afterwards succeeded to indigence, all that remained of the primitive church was this popular liberty now grown into licentiousness. The cardinals, bishops, priests and clergy, who composed the pope's council, had a great share in the election; but the rest of the clergy were desirous also of enjoying their ancient right; the people likewise considered their suffrage as necessary; and, in the opinion of the emperors, all these votes together were of no signification.

1130 Peter of Leon, the grandson of an opulent Jew, was elected by one faction; and Innocent II. by another. This occasioned a civil war: the Jew, being the richest of the two, remained master of Rome, and was protected by Roger king of Sicily (as hath been shewn in Chap. XLI.) the other being more artful and more fortunate, was acknowledged in France and Germany.

Here follows an historical fact which is well worthy of our attention. This Innocent II. in order to gain the emperor's suffrage, yielded to him and to his children the usufruct of all the demesnes belonging to the countess Matilda, by a deed dated the 13th of June 1133. At length the Jewish pontiff dying after a reign of eight years, Innocent II. was left peaceable possessor of the see of Rome, and a truce followed for some years between the empire and the priesthood. The enthusiasm of the crusades, which was then at its height, directed the minds of the people to other objects.

Rome, however, did not long remain quiet; the ancient love of liberty was not intirely rooted out of the people's breasts: several cities in Italy had taken the opportunity of these troubles to erect themselves into republics, such as Florence, Sienna, Bologna, Milan and Pavia. Rome had likewise the great examples before her eyes of Genoa, Venice and Pisa, and still

remembered that she had given birth to the Scipios. The people re-established a shadow of a senate, which had been established by the cardinals ; and created a patrician instead of two consuls. The new senate signified¹¹⁴⁴ to pope Lucius II. that the sovereignty resided in the people of Rome, and that the bishop ought to have no other care than that of the church.

These senators having entrenched themselves in the capitol, pope Lucius laid siege to it in person ; but was wounded in the head with a stone, of which he died a few days after.

About the same time Arnold of Brescia, one of those enthusiastical men, who are dangerous to themselves and the rest of mankind, went about from town to town preaching against the immense riches and luxury of the clergy. He came to Rome, where he found the minds of the people disposed to receive his doctrine ; he had conceived a flattering notion of being able to reform the popes, and to make Rome once more a free city. Eugenius III. who had been a Cistercian monk, was at that time pope. St. Bernard wrote to him in these words : " Beware of the Romans ; they are odious to heaven and earth, impious towards God, seditious amongst themselves, jealous of their neighbours, and cruel to strangers: they love nobody, and nobody loves them : desirous of making every body fear them, they are afraid of all the world, &c." If we compare these antitheses of St. Bernard with the lives of the many popes we have mentioned, we shall easily find an excuse for a people who bearing the name of Romans, wanted to be without a master.

Pope Eugenius III. had the policy to bring these people back to their accustomed yoke. The senate continued¹¹⁵⁵ some years after that : but Arnold of Brescia reaped no other fruit from his sermons, than being burnt at Rome under Adrian IV. the ordinary fate of reformers, who have more indiscretion than power.

I think it right to observe here, that this Adrian IV. an Englishman by birth, had arrived to this pitch of grandeur from the meanest condition of human life.

He was a beggar's son, and had been a beggar himself, strolling about from country to country, before he could obtain admittance as a servant among the monks of Valence in Dauphiné: after this he gradually raised himself, and at length we find him elected pope.

Mankind usually measure their behaviour by their present fortune. Adrian IV. was so much the more haughty, as he had raised himself to this dignity from the most abject condition. The church of Rome had always this advantage, of giving to merit what in other places is the consequence of high birth: and it is worthy of observation, that those popes who had behaved with the greatest spirit, were generally persons of obscure birth. There are monasteries at present in Germany, into which none but persons of noble families are admitted: Rome acts with more real greatness and less vanity.

C H A P. XLVIII.

Of Frederick Barbarossa.—Ceremonies at the Coronation of the Popes and Emperors.—Struggles of the Italians for Liberty, in Opposition to the Emperors.

1152 **A**T that time reigned in Germany Frederick I. commonly called *Barbareffa*, who was elected after the decease of his uncle Conrad III. not only by the German lords, but likewise by the Lombards, who gave their votes on this occasion. This prince who was comparable to the Othos and Charlemagnes, was obliged to go to Rome for this imperial crown, which the popes conferred with no less pride than regret; being ambitious to crown him as a vassal and vexed to see him their master. This ambiguous situation of the popes, of the emperors, the Romans, and the principal cities of Italy, caused the effusion of human blood every time a new Cæsar was crowned. The custom was, that when the emperor drew near to Rome in order for his coronation, the pope entrenched himself,

the

the people stood upon their guard, and all Italy was up in arms. The emperor promised that he would attempt nothing against the life, the person, or the honour of the pope, the cardinals or magistrates; and the pope, on his side, took the same oath to the emperor and his officers. Such was at that time the confused anarchy of the western part of Christendom, that the two principal personages of this little portion of the world, one of whom boasted himself the successor of the Cæsars, and the other of Jesus Christ, were both obliged to take an oath to each other, that they would not be assassins during the time of the ceremony. A knight armed cap-a-pee took this oath to Pope Adrian IV. in the emperor's name; and the pontiff took his oath in the presence of the knight.

The coronation or instalment of a pope, was at that time attended with as extraordinary ceremonies, which partook more of simplicity than barbarism. The pope elect was seated on a close stool, called the *Stercorarium*, and afterwards on a marble chair, where they presented him with the two keys; from thence he was removed to a third chair, where he was presented with twelve coloured stones. All these customs have been abolished by time, by which they were first introduced. When the emperor Frederick had taken the oath, pope Adrian went to meet him some miles from Rome.

The Roman ceremonial required, that his imperial majesty should prostrate himself before the pope, kiss his feet, hold his stirrup, and lead the holy father's white pad by the bridle the distance of nine Roman paces. It was not thus the popes received Charlemagne. Frederick looked upon this ceremony as a piece of insolence, and refused to submit to it: upon which all the cardinals fled, as if by this sacrilegious non-compliance he had given the signal for a civil war. But the Roman chancery, who kept a register of acts of this kind, made him sensible that his predecessors had complied with this part of their duty. I question whether any other emperor, except Lotharius II. son of Henry V. had led the pope's horse by the bridle. However,

However, the ceremony of kissing the pope's toe was not so shocking to Frederick, because custom had established it: it was the leading the horse by the bridle, and the holding the stirrup, that filled him with indignation, because it appeared new. Yet his pride submitted at length to those two affronts, which he considered only as empty marks of Christian humility, while they were looked upon by the court of Rome as proofs of subjection.

The deputies of the people of Rome were grown so insolent, since almost all the other cities of Italy had rung the alarm for liberty, that they wanted to stipulate on their side with the emperor; but upon opening their harangue with these words: "Great king, we have made you our fellow-citizen, and our prince, you that was a foreigner." The emperor, provoked at so much pride, silenced them, and told them in plain terms, "Rome is no longer what it was formerly; it is not true, that you invited me into Italy and made me your prince; Charlemagne and Otho conquered you by their prowess; and I am by established possession your lawful master." He dismissed them with June this answer, and was inaugurated without the walls of 8, the city by the pope, who put the sceptre and sword 1155 into his hands and the crown on his head.

At that time they had so confused an idea of the dignity and rights of the empire, and their several pretensions were so contradictory to each other, that on the one hand the Romans mutinied, and there was a great deal of blood spilt, because the pope had crowned the emperor without the consent of the senate and the people: and on the other hand, pope Adrian wrote in all his letters, that he had conferred on Frederick the benefice of the Roman empire, *beneficium imperii Romani*: the word *beneficium* signified literally a fief. He likewise caused a picture to be exhibited to public view in Rome, in which was represented Lotharius II. on his knees before pope Alexander II. holding both his hands joined between those of the pontiff, which was the

the characteristic of vassalage. The inscription on the picture was,

*Rex venit ante fores, jurans prius urbis honores :
Post homo fit papæ, sumit quo dante coronam.*

“The king swears at the gate to support the honour of Rome; and he becomes the pope’s vassal, who gives him the crown.”

Frederick was then at Besancon (for what we call Franche Comté, a part of the kingdom of Burgundy, had devolved to him by marriage) where he heard of these insolent manœuvres, and complained of them to his courtiers. A cardinal who was present made answer: “And of whom then does he hold the empire, but of the pope?” This speech so irritated Otho, count Palatine, that he was very near running him through the body with the imperial sword, which he held in his hand: the cardinal made his escape, and the pope negotiated. The Germans in those days decided every thing by the sword; and the court of Rome got off by equivocations.

Roger, conqueror of the Mussulmen in Sicily, and of the Christians in the kingdom of Naples, had obtained the investiture of these countries, by kissing the feet of pope Urban II. his prisoner, who reduced the duty, or service, to six hundred besants of gold, a coin in value about ten livres of the present French money. When pope Adrian was besieged by William in 1156, he yielded to him all ecclesiastical pretensions. He even consented that Sicily should never have any legate, nor be subject to an appeal to the see of Rome, except when the king pleased. Ever since that time the kings of Sicily, though the only princes that are vassals to the pope, are a kind of popes themselves in that island. The Roman pontiffs, thus adored and abused, bore a resemblance, if I may dare use the expression, to the idols which the Indians beat, in order to obtain favours from them.

Adrian

Adrian IV. took full revenge of every other prince that stood in need of his assistance; for thus he wrote to Henry II. king of England: "There is no doubt, and you know it well, that Ireland, and all the other islands that have embraced the faith, belong to the church of Rome: now you want to take possession of that island, in order to banish vice from thence, to enforce an observance of the laws, and with an intent of paying yearly St. Peter's penny for every house; and we grant you your request with pleasure."

If I may be allowed to make some reflections in this historical essay, I cannot help observing that the world is strangely governed. An English beggar, who was risen to be bishop of Rome, gives Ireland away, by his own authority, to a man who wants to usurp it. The popes had more than once engaged in war about the investiture with the crozier and ring; and yet we find Adrian IV. sending king Henry II. a ring as a mark of the investiture of Ireland. If a king had given a ring upon presenting to a prebend, he would have been deemed guilty of sacrilege.

The intrepid activity of Frederick Barbarossa was scarcely able to subdue the popes who disputed the empire, the Romans who refused to submit to the yoke, and all the cities of Italy which wanted to assert their liberty: he was obliged, at the same time, to check the Bohemians who mutinied, and the Poles who were at war with him: nevertheless, he succeeded in every point. He conquered Poland, and erected it into a tributary kingdom: and he quelled the tumults in Bohemia, which had been already made a kingdom by Henry IV. in 1086. It is said also, that the king of Denmark received the investiture of him. He secured the fidelity of the princes of the empire, by rendering himself formidable to foreign nations; and flew back to Italy, which was establishing its liberty on the troubles and perplexities of this prince. Here he found every thing in the utmost confusion, not so much owing to the efforts which the several cities had been making

making
party
disturb

After
tumult
Alexan
cessity
those p
ledged
and sca
of divi
Freder
and th
submit
that t
Freder
the pa
sarea;
* Alessa
ference
former

Hap
But th
and th
ty. A
right t
be thei
citizen
peror's
been s
put on
recruit
edict c
the wa
on the
by the
deavou
privileg

VOL.

making for the recovery of their liberty, as to that of party rage, which, as we have already seen, constantly disturbed the election of the popes.

After the death of Adrian IV. two opposite factions ¹¹⁶⁰ tumultuously elected the persons called Victor II. and Alexander III. The emperor's allies were under a necessity of acknowledging the same pope as he did; and those princes who were jealous of the emperor, acknowledged the other. That which was therefore the shame and scandal of Rome, unavoidably became the signal of division and discord over all Europe. Victor II. was Frederick Barbarossa's pope; and Germany, Bohemia, and the half of Italy, adhered to him, while the rest submitted to Alexander. It was in honour of this pope that the Milanese, who were the avowed enemies of Frederick, built the city of Alexandria. In vain did the partisans of Frederick insist it should be called *Cæsarea*; the pope's name prevailed, and it was called * *Alessandria della paglia*, a surname which shews the difference between this little city, and others of that name formerly built in honour of the real Alexander.

Happy age, had it produced no other disputes! But the Germans always wanted to be masters of Italy, ¹¹⁶² and the Italians were determined to support their liberty. And most certainly they had a more natural right to that liberty, than any German could have to be their master. The Milanese set the example. The citizens, become soldiers, surprised a party of the emperor's troops near Lodi and defeated them. Had they been seconded by the other cities, Italy would have put on a new face. But Frederick, who had time to recruit his army, laid siege to Milan, and issued an edict condemning its citizens to slavery: he then rased the walls and the houses, and ordered salt to be sown on the ruins. Brescia and Placentia were dismantled by the conqueror; and the other cities, which had endeavoured to shake off the yoke, were deprived of their privileges. But pope Alexander, who had stirred them

* Alexandria built of straw.

all up to revolt, came back to Rome upon the death of his competitor; and occasioned a civil war in that city. Frederick caused another to be elected pope, and upon the death of him, he nominated another. Upon this Alexander III. retired to France, the natural asylum of every pope who is at variance with the emperor. But still the fire he had kindled raged with all its fury; the Italian cities entered into a confederacy for the maintenance of their liberty; and the people of Milan rebuilt their city in spite of the emperor. The pope at length, acquired more strength by his negotiations, than the emperor had done by his victories: Frederick Barbarossa was obliged to give way; and 1177 Venice had the honour of bringing about the reconciliation. The emperor, the pope, and a multitude of princes and cardinals repaired to this city, already mistress of the sea, and one of the wonders of the world. Here the emperor terminated the dispute, by acknowledging the pope, kissing his feet, and holding his stirrup on the banks of the sea. Every thing turned to the advantage of the church: Frederick promised to restore what had belonged to the holy see; but still the lands of the countess Matilda were not specified. At the same time he made a truce for six years with the cities of Italy. Milan, which was then rebuilding, Pavia, Brescia, and a great many others, thanked the pope for having restored them that precious liberty for which they had been fighting: and the holy father in a transport of joy, cried out, "It has pleased God that an old man, and a priest, should triumph, without bloodshed, over a powerful and formidable emperor."

It is remarkable, that during this long quarrel, though pope Alexander III. had often performed the ceremony of excommunicating the emperor, yet he never went so far as to depose him. Is not this conduct not only a mark of this pope's great prudence, but likewise a general condemnation of the extravagance of Gregory VII.?

Peace

Pe
rossa
bath
that
ander
with
bably
Of
tensio
Bolog
belon
hereti
mony
took
him n
over
the e
other
Rome
her ad
As
a glor
He en
for th
suffic
And y
which
la rabb
The
with a

T
vigour

Peace being thus restored to Italy, Frederick Barbarossa set out for the wars of the crusades, and died by 1190 bathing himself in the Cydnus, of the same illness as that which had formerly so nearly proved fatal to Alexander the Great, when he plunged himself, covered with sweat, into that river. This disorder was probably a pleurisy.

Of all the emperors, Frederic had carried his pretensions the highest. In 1158 he made the civilians of Bologna pass a determination, that the whole world belonged to him, and that the contrary opinion was heretical. But what was more substantial, at the ceremony of his coronation the senate and people of Rome took the oath of allegiance to him; an oath that did him no service, when pope Alexander III. triumphed over him at the congress of Venice. Isaac Angelus, the emperor of Constantinople, never gave him any other title than that of advocate of the church of Rome; and Rome did all the mischief she could to her advocate.

As for pope Alexander, he lived four years longer in a glorious tranquillity, beloved by Rome and all Italy. He enacted, in a numerous council, that henceforward for the canonical election of a pope, it should be sufficient to have two-thirds of only the cardinal votes. And yet this regulation could not prevent the schisms, which were afterwards caused by what they call in Italy *la rabbia papale*.

The election of a pope was almost always attended with a civil war for upwards of two centuries.

C H A P. XLIX.

Of the Emperor Henry VI. and of Rome.

THE quarrel betwixt Rome and the German empire still continued to subsist with more or less vigour. We are told that when Henry VI. son of the emperor

emperor Frederic Barbarossa received, upon his knees, the imperial crown from the hands of pope Celestine III. the holy father, who was then more than eighty-four years of age, kicked it off the emperor's head with his foot. This fact is not at all probable; but its being believed shews sufficiently to what a degree the animosity of parties was carried. Had the pope behaved in that indecent manner, it would have been only a mark of dotage.

This coronation of the emperor Henry VI. exhibits to our view a far nobler object, and much more important concerns. He wanted to be king of the two Sicilies; and notwithstanding his imperial dignity, he consented to receive the pope's investiture for dominions, which heretofore yielded homage to the empire, and of which he looked upon himself as lord paramount and lawful proprietor. He requested to be the pope's liege vassal, and the pope refused him. The Romans would neither have Henry VI. for their neighbour, nor the king of Naples for their master; yet they were obliged to have him whether they would or not. Some nations seem doomed to servitude, and to submit to the first invader. Of the legitimate line of the Norman conquerors there was none remaining but the princess Constantia, daughter of king Roger I. and married to Henry VI. Tancred, a bastard of this line, had been recognized as sovereign by the people and by the holy see. The question then was, who should be king; Tancred, who had the right by election, or Henry who had a right by his wife? The point was to be decided by the sword. In vain did the people of the two Sicilies proclaim the young son of Tancred upon the death of his father: it was Henry's good fortune
1193 to prevail.

One of the meanest actions a sovereign can be guilty of, contributed to this prince's success. Richard *Cœur de Lion*, the intrepid king of England, in his return from a crusade, having been cast away upon the coast of Dalmatia, with difficulty escaped on shore, and travelled through the territories of the duke of Austria.

This

This duke, in defiance of the laws of hospitality, made the king of England prisoner, and sold him to the emperor Henry VI. as Arabs sell their slaves. Henry insisted on a large ransom, and with the money undertook the conquest of the two Sicilies, where he committed an horrid and useless act of barbarity, by ordering the body of king Tancred to be dug up, and beheaded by the common executioner. The young king his son, after having had his eyes plucked out, was made an eunuch, and imprisoned at Coire in the country of the Grisons. His sisters were confined with their mother in Alsace. The adherents of this unfortunate family, whether lords or bishops, died by the hands of the executioner; and all the treasures of the kingdom were plundered and carried into Germany.

Thus Naples and Sicily, after having been conquered by Frenchmen, was transferred to the Germans; and more than twenty provinces fell under the dominion of sovereigns, whom nature had placed at the distance of three hundred leagues. This has been a perpetual source of discord, and a very strong proof of the prudence of such a regulation as the Salic law; a law still more advantageous to a small than to an extensive state. Henry VI. was then more powerful than Frederic Barbarossa had ever been; almost despotic in Germany, sovereign of Lombardy, Naples, and Sicily, and lord paramount of Rome, so that he was truly a formidable prince. But his cruelty ruined him; his own wife Constantia, whose family he had extirpated, is said to have conspired against this tyrant, and to have caused him to be poisoned.

1198

Upon the death of Henry VI. the empire of Germany was divided. This was not the case of France; because the French had been prudent or fortunate enough to establish the order of succession. But the imperial title, affected by Germany, contributed to render the crown elective: every bishop and every great lord gave his vote. This right of electing, and being elected, flattered the ambition of the several princes, and

and was sometimes the cause of the misfortunes of the empire.

1198 The young Frederic II. son of Henry VI. was just out of his cradle, when he was chosen emperor by a faction, who gave the title of *King of the Romans* to his uncle Philip: another party chose Otho of Saxony. From these divisions of Germany the popes reaped a very different advantage, from what the emperors had derived from those of Italy.

Innocent III. son of a gentleman of Agnani, in the neighbourhood of Rome, at length raised the structure of that temporal power, the materials of which his predecessors had been collecting during the space of four hundred years. The excommunicating of Philip, the attempting to dethrone young Frederick, the pretending to exclude for ever, from the throne of Germany and Italy, the house of Swabia, which was so odious to the popes, and the aspiring to be the arbiter of kings, was become the ordinary style of the see of Rome since the time of Gregory VII. But Innocent III. did not stop at such ceremonious trifles: he had now a fair opportunity, which he readily embraced, of recovering what was called the patrimony of St. Peter, which had been so long contested, and was part of the inheritance of the famous countess Matilda.

Romagna, Umbria, the March of Ancona, Orbicello, and Viterbo, acknowledged the pope for their sovereign; and his dominion extended from sea to sea. The Romans did not carry their arms further the four first ages of their republic, nor were these countries of such value to them as they proved to the popes. Innocent III. made even the conquest of Rome; so that the new senate submitted itself to him, and became the pope's and not the Roman senate: the title of consul was also abolished. The Roman pontiffs began from that time to be kings indeed, and the prejudices of religion occasionally rendered them masters of crowned heads. But this great temporal power in Italy was not of long duration.

Nothing

N
which
church
court
the a
have
the e
peror
was f
tentio
which
empire

The S
and
Cen
Eng
bish
—I
Eng

T
were e
out th
Spain
vassal,
" aga
" tice
upon t
he hac
king r
and to
limited
fief.
ordinan

Nothing can be more interesting, than the disputes which arose in those days, between the heads of the church, and France, Germany, and England. The court of Rome constantly acted a leading part in the affairs of all the other courts of Europe. You have seen the quarrels between the priesthood and the empire down to pope Innocent III. and to the emperors Philip, Henry, and Otho, while Frederick II. was still in his minority. We must now direct our attention to France and England, and to the interests which these kingdoms had to manage with the German empire.

C H A P. L.

The State of France and England, till the Reign of St. Louis, and of John Lackland, and Henry III. during the twelfth Century.—Great Change in the public Administration in England and France.—Murder of Thomas Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury.—England becomes a Province to Rome.—Pope Innocent III. outwits the Kings of France and England.

THE feudal government was established almost in every country in Europe, and the laws of chivalry were every where near the same, particularly throughout the empire, and in France, and England, and Spain it was regulated, that if the lord of a fief said to his vassal, "Come along with me, for I mean to wage war against my lord the king, who refuses to do me justice:" the vassal was obliged immediately to wait upon the king, and to ask him whether it was true, that he had denied to do justice to that lord. In case the king refused it, the vassal was forced to join his lord, and to march with him against the sovereign within a limited number of days, under penalty of losing his fief. Such a regulation might properly be intitled, *An ordinance to wage a civil war.*

The

The emperor Frederick Barbarossa abolished this law in 1158; a law which had been established by custom, and which that custom still maintained in the empire, notwithstanding all his care, whenever the great vassals were powerful enough to make war against their sovereign. It remained in full force in France, till the extinction of the house of Burgundy. In England, the feudal government soon gave way to the freedom of the subject; and in Spain, it submitted to the despotic power of the prince.

In the beginning of the race of *Hugues* or *Hugh*, commonly, though improperly, called the Capetian race, from a nick-name given to that king, all the little vassals were in arms against the great; and the kings of France were frequently at war with the barons of the duchy of France. The descendants of the Danish pirates, who reigned in Normandy and England, always countenanced these dissensions. This was the reason why Louis the Fat found so much difficulty in reducing the *sieur de Couci*, the baron de Corbeil, the *sieur de Montlhen*, the *sieur de Poiset*, and the lords of *Baudouin* and *Chateaufort*; and it does not appear that he dared, or was able to condemn or put to death these rebellious vassals. Since that time, things are greatly changed in France.

England, from the time of Henry I. was governed in the same manner as France. In the reign of Stephen, son to Henry I. there were no less than a thousand fortified castles in England. The kings of France and England could do nothing then, without the consent and assistance of a multitude of barons; and these times were, as we have seen, the reign of anarchy and confusion.

Louis the Young, king of France, had acquired an extensive domain by marriage, but lost it by a divorce. Eleanor his wife, heiress of Guienne and Poitou, offered him such affronts as a husband ought not to be acquainted with. This princess was so tired of attending her husband in those celebrated and unfortunate crusades, that she resolved to indemnify herself, to use her

his o
to sp
a mo
unde
have
when
those
to co
of th
histor
thoro
by a
that
over
oath
of co
could
this m
times
two p
have b
afterw
of the
notwit
counci
only c
and in
accuse
fact, a
motive
It re
Christi
to each
declare
away h
who ha
was de
yet it
excom
had the
VOL

his own words, for the wretched hours she was obliged to spend in company with a king, who was fitter to be a monk. The king caused his marriage to be annulled under pretence of being too near a-kin: those who have censured this prince for not keeping the dowry when he repudiated his wife, do not reflect that in those days a king of France was not powerful enough to commit such an act of injustice. This divorce is one of the most considerable objects of the civil law, and historians would have done well to have investigated it thoroughly. The marriage was dissolved at Beaujenci by a council of French bishops, on an idle pretext that Eleanor was second cousin to Louis; and moreover certain lords of Gascony were obliged to make oath that the married couple were within the degrees of consanguinity, as if the truth of such a relationship could not be known but by an oath. It is certain that this marriage was null by the superstitious laws of those times of ignorance. But if the marriage was null, the two princesses, who were born of that marriage, must have been bastards; and yet they were both married afterwards as legitimate children: so that this marriage of their mother Eleanor must have been reputed valid, notwithstanding the decision of the council. The council then did not pronounce this marriage null, but only declared it to be void, and granted a divorce; and in the whole proceedings the king never once accused his wife of adultery. It was therefore, in fact, a divorce in full council, upon the most frivolous motive.

It remains to know how, agreeable to the rules of Christianity, Eleanor and Louis could again be married to each other. St. Matthew and St. Luke expressly declare, that a man cannot marry after having put away his former wife, nor can any man marry a woman who has been so put away by her husband. This law was delivered from the mouth of Christ himself, and yet it has never been observed. What a subject for excommunications, interdicts, commotions, and wars, had the popes then intermeddled in such an affair with

which they have since so frequently concerned themselves!

A descendant of William the Conqueror, Henry II. afterwards king of England, and who was already master of Normandy, Maine, Anjou, and Touraine, was not so nice as Louis the Young, and thought it no disgrace to marry a gallant lady, who brought him Guienne and Poictou for her dowry. Henry, who soon after this ascended the throne of England, paid homage to the king of France for those provinces, which the latter would have been glad to repay to the English king for such valuable territories.

The feudal government was equally disagreeable to the kings of France, England, and Germany. Those kings undertook, almost at the same time, and by the same measures, to raise troops independently of their vassals. Louis the Young granted privileges to all the towns in his demesnes, on condition that the inhabitants of each parish should repair to the army under the banner of the saint of their parochial church, as the kings themselves marched under the banner of St. Denis. Numbers of bondmen were enfranchised at that time, and became citizens; and the citizens had the privilege of chusing their municipal officers, their sheriffs, and their mayors.

It is about the years 1137 and 1138, that we may fix the æra of the re-establishment of this municipal government in the cities and boroughs. Henry II. of England, granted the same privileges to several towns, in order to get money from them for the raising of troops.

Similar measures were adopted by the emperors in Germany. The city of Spire, for example, purchased in 1166, the privilege of chusing her own burgomasters, notwithstanding the opposition of the bishop: thus liberty, the natural privilege of mankind, arose from the indigence of princes. But this liberty was only a lesser servitude in comparison to what those cities of Italy enjoyed, which had then erected themselves into republics.

The

The government of Upper Italy was beginning to be modelled after the plan of that of ancient Greece: most of the great cities having entered into a confederacy upon the recovery of their liberty, seemed to bid fair for becoming a formidable republic; but this government was soon destroyed by great and petty tyrants.

The popes had to negotiate with each of these cities, and likewise with the kingdom of Naples, Germany, France, England, and Spain. Every one of these had some disputes with the popes, who always came off with the advantage.

Louis the Young having in 1142 excluded one of his subjects, named Peter la Châtre, from being made bishop of Bourges, the bishop was chosen in spite of him, and supported by Rome; and afterwards he interdicted the royal demesnes situate in his bishopric. This gave rise to a civil war, which was ended at length by a treaty, by which the king acknowledged the bishop, and intreated the pope to take off the interdict.

The kings of England had still greater broils with the church. One of the kings, whose memory is most revered by the English, is Henry I. the third king from the conquest, and who began his reign in 1100. They are indebted to him for his having abolished the law of *couvrefeu*, or *curfew*, which was so great a restraint to them. He proved himself a wise legislator, in establishing the same weights and measures in every part of his dominions; a regulation which was easily executed in England, and which has been always unsuccessfully projected in France. He confirmed the laws of Edward the Confessor, which had been abolished by his father, William the Conqueror. In short, in order to bring the clergy over to his interest, he renounced the right of *regale*, which gave him the usufruct of all vacant benefices: a privilege which the kings of France continue to preserve.

But he signalized his reign chiefly by a charter of privileges which he granted to the English nation; this

was the origin of the liberties of that kingdom, which have since been so greatly enlarged. His father, William the Conqueror, had treated the English as slaves, of whom he was not afraid: his son shewed a greater regard for them; but it was because he stood in need of their assistance. He was a younger son, and had usurped the crown from Robert his elder brother. This was evidently the source of so much indulgence. But artful and absolute as he was, yet he could not hinder his clergy, and the see of Rome, from opposing those very investitures. In short, he was obliged to desist from his pretensions, and to be contented with the homage, which the bishops yielded him for their temporalities.

As for France, it had not yet felt these troubles, because the ceremony of the crozier had not yet been introduced into that kingdom.

At that time the English bishops were little less than temporal princes in their respective dioceses: this at least is certain, that the first vassals of the crown did not surpass them either in power or riches. In the reign of Stephen, successor of Henry I. a bishop of Salisbury, whose name was Roger, and who was married, and lived publicly with a woman whom he acknowledged for his wife, waged war against the king his sovereign; and we are told that in one of his castles, taken in the course of this war, there were found forty thousand silver marks, which, if they were each of the value of ten shillings, amounted to an amazing sum; and which, even supposing them to have been only marks of a crown value each, must at any rate have been a considerable treasure, at a time when specie was so scarce.

After the reign of Stephen, which was disturbed by civil wars, England assumed a new form under Henry II. who strengthened this crown by the accession of Normandy, Anjou, Touraine, Saintonge, Poitou, and Guienne. The whole enjoyed a perfect tranquillity, when this happiness was disturbed by the great quarrel between

betw
St.

law
dign
bish
lega
seco
ener
of m
be d
at t
in t
enco
dispr
arch
puni
offic
The
shou
subje
or o
or fu
the f
to c
cour
the
Beck
affen
cusec
right
of t

U
mean
refus
beca
demi
the l
to F
natur

between the king and Thomas Becket, commonly called St. Thomas of Canterbury.

This Thomas Becket who from being a private lawyer, had been raised by king Henry II. to the dignity of chancellor and afterwards to that of archbishop of Canterbury, primate of all England, and legate of the holy see, had no sooner risen to be the second person in the kingdom, than he became an enemy to the first. A certain priest having been guilty of murder, the primate ordained that he should only be deprived of his benefice. The king was provoked at this judgment, and told him, that since a layman, in the like case, was punishable with death, he was encouraging the clergy to commit murder, by thus disproportioning the punishment to the crime. The archbishop maintained, that no clergyman could be punished with death; and immediately resigned his office of chancellor, in order to be intirely independent. The king proposed in parliament, that no bishop should be permitted to go to Rome; that none of his subjects should appeal to the holy see; that no vassal, or officer of the crown, should be excommunicated, or suspended from his office, without the permission of the sovereign; and in short, that the clergy, in regard to criminal cases, should be subject to the ordinary course of justice. These proposals were passed by all the temporal peers, but rejected at first by Thomas Becket. At length he was prevailed upon to give his assent to these equitable laws; yet he afterwards accused himself before the pope of having betrayed the rights of the church, and promised never to be guilty of the like weakness.

Upon his being accused before the peers of misdemeanors during the time he had been chancellor, he refused to acknowledge the jurisdiction of the court, because he was an archbishop. However, he was condemned to imprisonment as a seditious person, both by the lords spiritual and temporal; upon which he fled to France, where he waited on Louis the Young, the natural enemy of the king of England. While he was

in

in France, he excommunicated almost all the lords of Henry's privy council; and wrote in the following manner to that prince: "I ought it is true to respect you as my king, but as my spiritual son it is my duty to chastise you." In the same letter he threatened him with being changed into a beast like Nebuchadnezzar; though after all, there does not seem to have been any great resemblance between Nebuchadnezzar and Henry II.

The king of England did all he could to engage the archbishop to return to his duty: in a voyage he made to France, he chose Louis the Young, his lord paramount, for arbitrator; upon which occasion he expressed himself to Louis in the following words: "Let the archbishop act towards me, as the holiest of his predecessors have behaved towards the lowest of mine, and I shall be satisfied." At length a feigned
 1170 reconciliation was concluded between the king and the prelate; and Becket returned to England; but it was only to excommunicate all the bishops, canons and inferior clergy, that had declared against him. They made their complaints to the king, who was then in Normandy, and his passion being raised to the highest degree, he cried out, "Is it possible, that not one of my servants will rid me of this turbulent priest?"

This expression, which indeed was very indiscreet, seemed only to encourage any ruffian to indulge the king's revenge, by assassinating a man who deserved to be punished only by the laws.

Accordingly four of his domestics went to Canterbury, and murdered the archbishop at the foot of the altar. Thus a man, who might have been arraigned and condemned as a rebel, became a martyr, and the king was loaded with the shame and horror of this murder.

None of the historians inform us of any punishments being inflicted on those four assassins; it would seem therefore as if justice was done only on the king.

We have already seen how Adrian IV. gave Henry II. leave to usurp Ireland. Alexander III. successor to
 Adrian

Adrian IV. confirmed this permission, on condition that the king should positively swear, that he had never given orders for this murder, and should go barefooted to the tomb of the archbishop, to be whipped with rods by the canons of the church of Canterbury. It would have been great in the pope to give away Ireland, if Henry had had any legal pretensions to it or the pope any right to dispose of it; but it was much greater to oblige a powerful but guilty king to ask forgiveness of his crime.

The king therefore undertook the conquest of Ireland in 1172. It was at that time a savage country, and had been subdued in part by the earl of Pembroke with only twelve hundred men. This nobleman wanted to secure his conquest; but Henry being stronger than him, and being moreover furnished with a bull from the pope, easily made himself master of the whole island, which ever since remained under the English dominions; though in a barren, poor and useless condition, till at length in the eighteenth century, agriculture, manufactures, arts and sciences, have been all carried to perfection there; so that Ireland, though a conquered country, is become one of the most flourishing provinces in Europe.

Henry II. whose children rebelled against him, performed the penance after having subdued Ireland. He solemnly renounced all the prerogatives of the crown, which he had maintained against Becket. The English have since condemned the renunciation, and even this penance inflicted on their king. He ought not indeed to have resigned his prerogative, but he should have repented the murder: the interest of mankind requires that there should be a curb to restrain the arbitrary sway of sovereigns, and to protect the lives of the people. This curb of religion might, by universal agreement, have been placed in the hands of the pope, as we have already observed. The supreme pontiff by interfering no otherwise with temporal quarrels than to appease them, by admonishing kings and subjects of their duty, by rebuking them for their transgressions, and

and reserving excommunications for the most flagitious crimes, would have been always revered as God's image upon earth: but mankind are reduced to depend upon the laws and customs of each country for their defence; laws which are often despised, and customs which are as often perverted.

- 1189 England enjoyed a perfect tranquillity under Richard Cœur-de-Lion, the son and successor of Henry II. This prince was unfortunate in regard to the crusades, but his country was not so. Richard had some of these disputes with Philip Augustus, which are indeed inevitable between a lord paramount and a powerful vassal. These contentions made no alteration in the condition of their respective subjects: wars of this nature, between Christian princes, are similar in their effects to a pestilence, which depopulates provinces, without making any change in their limits, customs or manners. The most remarkable circumstance of these wars, is that Richard took from Philip Augustus his register of charters which he always carried with him. This register contained the several particulars of the revenues of the prince, a list of his vassals; and the state of his slaves and freedmen. The king of France was obliged to make a new register, in which his prerogative was rather increased than diminished.

- 1194 Another event worthy of attention is the captivity of a bishop of Beauvais, who was taken in his military accoutrements by king Richard. Pope Celestin III. demanded the bishop; "You must restore me my son," said he in his letter to Richard. But the king sent the bishop's cuirass to the pope, and at the same time answered him in these words from the history of Joseph, "Know now whether it be thy sons coat, or no?"

In regard to this warlike prelate it ought to be mentioned, that though the feudal laws did not oblige the bishops to fight, yet they enjoined them to lead their vassals to the rendezvous of the troops.

Philip Augustus seized on the temporalities of the bishops of Orleans and Auxerre, for not having complied with this abuse, which was now become a duty.

The

The bishops were condemned; upon which they suspended divine service throughout the kingdom, but were glad at length to come off by making a submission.

We shall see in the history of the crusades the rest of the adventures of Richard Cœur-de-Lion. John Lackland, his brother and successor, was in possession of a greater extent of territory than any other prince in Europe; for besides his father's dominions, he was also master of Britany, which he usurped from prince Arthur his nephew, to whom this province had devolved in right of his mother. But by invading the right of others, he at length was stripped of his own, and became a striking example, that should fill all bad princes with terror. He began with endeavouring to take possession of Britany, which belonged to his nephew Arthur, whom he took prisoner in an engagement, and confined in the tower of Rouen; nor was it ever known what afterwards became of this young prince. All Europe with justice accused king John of having murdered his nephew: and luckily for the instruction of all kings, it may be said, that this first crime was the cause of all his misfortunes. The feudal laws, which in other countries had been productive of such mischiefs and disorders, were attended here with a memorable instance of justice. The countess of Britany, mother of prince Arthur, presented to the court of peers in France, a petition signed by the barons of Britany. The king of England was summoned by the peers to make his appearance; and the summons was served upon him at London by the serjeants at arms. The king, who was accused, sent a bishop to Philip Augustus to demand a safe conduct. "Let him come, said the king, he safely may." The bishop then asked, whether he would be safe also in returning? "Yes, answered the king, if the judgment of the peers will permit." John not appearing, the peers of France condemned him to death, and declared all his possessions in France to be forfeited to the king. But who were these peers that passed sentence of death on a king of England? They could not be ecclesiastics, for they cannot assist

on a trial upon life and death. We are not told that there was at that time in Paris a count of Toulouse, and never was the signature of these counts seen to any act of the peers. Baudouin IX. count of Flanders, was then at Constantinople intriguing for the remains of the Eastern empire. The count of Champagne was dead and the succession contested. The accused person himself was duke of Guienne and Normandy. The assembly of the peers was composed of barons holding immediately of the crown. This is a point of great importance, which our historians ought to have well examined, instead of amusing themselves with drawing up armies in battle array, or tiring our patience with relations of sieges of castles that no longer exist.

There can be no doubt but that the assembly of French barons which condemned the king of England, was the same that was held at Melun to regulate the feudal laws *stabilimentum feudorum*. Eudes, duke of Burgundy, presided at this meeting, under Philip Augustus. In the acts of this assembly we likewise meet with the names of Herve count of Nevers, Renaud count of Boulogne, Gaucher count of St. Paul, and Guy of Dampier: but what is very remarkable, we do not find the name of any great officer of the crown.

Philip immediately took advantage of the crime committed by the king his vassal. John seems to have been of the same disposition as all tyrannical and dastardly princes: he suffered himself to be tamely stripped of Normandy, Guienne, and Poitou, and withdrew to England, where he was hated and despised. At first he found some relief in the pride of the English nation, who were provoked to see their king condemned in France; but the English barons were soon tired of granting money to a prince who did not know how to apply it. To complete his misfortune, John quarrelled with the court of Rome about an archbishop of Canterbury, whom the pope wanted to nominate in opposition to the laws.

1212 Innocent III. that prelate under whom the see of Rome became so formidable, interdicted the kingdom of

of Eng
obey
terribl
Philip
in per
fins, in
even g
expedi
recover
then d
away
some y
subject
for hav
then d
abusive
bishop
ject as
ferently
executi
possessi
wife, w
commu
executi
ed a w
(or rat
that ha
the En
king P
The F
on his
a defen
part of
lation
horror
proceed
tives o
he was
army o
he adv

of England, and strictly prohibited John's subjects to obey him. This ecclesiastical thunderbolt was really terrible, because the pope put it into the hands of Philip Augustus, to whom he transferred the kingdom in perpetuity, promising him the remission of all his sins, if he succeeded in the reduction of England. He even granted the same indulgences on account of this expedition, as had been given to those who went to recover the Holy Land. The king of France did not then declare, that it was not the pope's place to give away crowns: he himself had been excommunicated some years before, in 1199, and his kingdom had been subjected to an interdict by this very pope Innocent III. for having attempted to marry another wife. He had then declared the censures of Rome to be insolent and abusive; and had seized on the temporalities of every bishop and priest in France, that had been so bad a subject as to obey the pope. But he thought quite differently when he saw himself commissioned with the execution of a bull, which was to put England into his possession. Then he took again to his bed that very wife, whose divorce had been the cause of so many excommunications; and bent his mind intirely upon executing the sentence of the see of Rome. He employed a whole year in building seventeen hundred ships (or rather large boats) and in raising the finest army that had ever been seen in France. The aversion which the English bore to king John, might, in regard to king Philip, be esteemed equivalent to another army. The French king was just ready to set sail, and John on his side was making every preparative necessary for a defence. But though he was so greatly hated by a part of the nation, yet by means of the perpetual emulation between the English and the French, by the horror his subjects conceived against the pope's arbitrary proceedings, and in fine, by the help of the prerogatives of the crown, which were still very considerable, he was able to raise and keep together a few weeks, an army of near sixty thousand men, at the head of which he advanced as far as Dover, to meet the person who

had tried and condemned him in France, and was coming to dethrone him in England.

1213 All Europe was then in expectation of a decisive engagement betwixt the two kings, when the pope tricked them both, and artfully usurped to himself what he had given away to Philip. A subdeacon, named Pandulph, who from being one of the pope's domestics had been appointed legate in France and England, was the person who concluded this extraordinary negotiation. He crossed over to Dover under pretence of treating with the barons in favour of the king of France, and being there introduced to King John, said to him, "You are certainly undone; the French fleet is just ready to sail; your army will desert you, and the only resource you have left is immediately to submit yourself to the protection of the holy see." John consented, and swore to it, and sixteen barons took the same oath on John's behalf. A strange kind of oath, by which they bound themselves to a submission, without so much as knowing the conditions of it. The artful Italian terrified the king to such a degree, and so dexterously managed the minds of the barons, that at length, on the 15th of May, 1213, in the house of the knights templars in the suburb of Dover, John, upon his knees and with his hands between those of the legate, pronounced these words:

"I, John by the grace of God, king of England and lord of Ireland, for the expiation of my sins, and out of my pure free will, and with the advice of my barons, give unto the church of Rome, to pope Innocent and to his successors, the kingdoms of England and Ireland, with all their rights; and will hold them as a vassal of the pope; I will be faithful to God, to the Roman church, to my lord the pope, and to his successors lawfully elected. I bind myself to pay him a tribute of a thousand marks of silver yearly, that is, seven hundred for the kingdom of England, and three hundred for Ireland."

A sum of money was then delivered into the hands of the legate as the first payment of the tribute; and they

likew
deaco
crow
thofe
their

Ph
for th
at len
longe
now b
John

Th
the k
dange
muni
into a
Franc
This
puted
ry VI
fovere
empe
again

Of O
Of
the
sing
sing

T
princ
able,
Engl
Augu
these

likewise gave him the crown and scepter. The Italian deacon trod the money under his feet, and kept the crown and scepter five days; after which he restored those ornaments to the king, as a favour from the pope their common master.

Philip Augustus was all this while waiting at Boulogne for the return of the legate, to put to sea. The legate at length came back, to let him know, that he was no longer permitted to make a descent upon England, now become a fief of the Roman church, and that king John was under the protection of the holy see.

The donation which the pope had made to Philip of the kingdom of England, might have then proved of dangerous consequence to him: for another excommunicated prince, king John's nephew, had entered into an alliance with his uncle to oppose the designs of France, which was then becoming too formidable. This excommunicated prince was Otho IV. who disputed the empire with young Frederick II. son of Henry VI. at the same time that he was disputing the sovereignty of Italy with the pope. He is the only emperor of Germany that ever gave battle in person against a king of France.

C H A P. LI.

Of Otho IV. and Philip Augustus in the thirteenth Century.—Of the Battle of Bouvines.—Of England and France to the Death of Louis VIII. Father of St. Louis.—Of the singular Power of the Court of Rome, and the still more singular Penance of Louis VIII.

THOUGH the system of the balance of Europe was not established till these latter times, yet its princes seem always to have united as far as they were able, against the preponderating powers. Germany, England, and the Netherlands armed against Philip Augustus, in the same manner as we have since seen these countries united against Louis XIV. Ferrand, count

count of Flanders, joined the emperor Otho IV. he was Philip's vassal, but it was this very reason that induced him to declare war against the French king, as well as against the count of Boulogne. Thus Philip was very near being crushed only for having accepted of the pope's present: but by his fortune and his courage, he extricated himself out of this danger with the greatest glory that a king of France ever merited.

There is a little village between Lisle and Tournay, called Bouvines, in the neighbourhood of which Otho IV. appeared at the head of an army, which was said to have been an 100,000 strong, intending to give battle to Philip, who had not half the number. It was about that time they began to use the cross-bow, a weapon first invented under Louis the Fat. But what decided the fate of the day, was the heavy cavalry, armed cap-a-pee. This complete armour was a privilege of honour granted to the knights, and which the 'squires could not pretend to, for they were not permitted to be invulnerable. All that a knight had to fear, was his being wounded either in the face, when he lifted up the visier of his helmet; or in the side, when he was knocked down, and they had pulled off his coat of mail; or under the arm-pits, when he lifted up his arm to strike.

There were also some troops of cavalry drawn from the body of the commonalty, who were not near so well armed as the knights. As for the infantry, they wore what defensive arms they pleased, and their offensive weapons were the sword, the arrow, the club, and the sling.

It was a bishop who drew up Philip Augustus's army in order of battle; his name was Guerin, and he had been lately nominated to the bishopric of Senlis. The famous bishop of Beauvais, whom Richard king of England had kept prisoner so long, was also present at this battle: he always made use of a club, saying, "It was against the rules of the church to spill human blood." We are not told in what manner either the emperor or the king ranged their troops. Philip, before the bat-

tle

tle be
Deus
up an
occasi
honou
stand
pole,
and o
The
white
indee
paint
The
which
moun
than
of cro
Bel
carry
was i
those
his
carrie
word
thele
almo
Fren
was K
As
ran a
were
menti
his ho
and r
witho
W
groun
with

He began, ordered his men to sing the psalm, *Exsurgat Deus & dissipentur inimici ejus**, as if Otho had taken up arms against the Almighty. The French, on former occasions of this sort, had been used to sing verses in honour of Roland and Charlemagne. Otho's imperial standard was raised upon four wheels; it was a long pole, to which they had fastened a painted dragon, and over the dragon was raised an eagle of gilt wood. The royal standard of France was a gilded staff with white silk colours sewed with flower-de-luces, which indeed had been for a long time only the fancy of painters, but were now become the arms of France. The old crowns of the kings of Lombardy, of which there are very exact prints in Muratori, are mounted with this ornament, which is nothing more than the head of a spear, tied with two other pieces of crooked iron.

Besides the royal standard, Philip Augustus made them carry the oriflamb of St. Denis: whenever the king was in danger, they raised or lowered one or other of those standards. Every knight had also a standard of his own, and the great knights had other colours carried before them, which were called banners. This word banner, though so very honourable, was nevertheless common to the colours of the infantry, who were almost all bondmen. The military shout among the French was, *Mon joye Saint Denis*; that of the Germans was *Kyrie eleison*.

As a proof that the knights completely armed seldom ran any other risk than that of being dismounted, and were not hurt but by some great chance, we need only mention that Philip Augustus, after being knocked off his horse, was a long time surrounded by the enemy, and received several blows with all kinds of weapons without losing a drop of blood.

We are even told, that while he lay upon the ground, a German soldier wanted to pierce his neck with a dart that had a double hook, but could not

* The 68th Psalm.

compass his end. Not one knight was killed in the battle, except William Longchamp, who unluckily died of a blow on the eye levelled through the visier of his helmet.

Among the Germans were reckoned five and twenty knights bannerets, and seven counts of the empire, prisoners, but not one of them was wounded.

The emperor Otho lost the battle, in which 30,000 Germans were said to have been slain; but the number was probably exaggerated. We do not find, however, that the king of France made any conquest on the side of Germany after the victory obtained at Bouvines; but he acquired a greater influence over his vassals.

The person who lost most by this battle was John, king of England, whose last hopes were centered in the emperor Otho. This emperor soon after, in 1218, died in a state of penitence: it is said, that he used to order his scullions to trample upon him, and to suffer himself to be scourged by the monks, according to the opinion of the princes of that time, who believed that by this kind of discipline they could atone for the blood of so many thousands.

It is not true, as so many writers have asserted, that Philip, on the very day he gained the battle of Bouvines, received also the news of another victory obtained by his son Louis VIII. over king John. On the contrary, John had been rather successful in Poitou; but being abandoned by his allies, he concluded a truce with Philip. This truce was of great use to him, for his English subjects were become his most inveterate enemies, and treated him with the utmost contempt, because he had made himself the vassal of Rome. The barons compelled him to sign that famous
1215 charter, called *Magna Charta*, or *the Charter of the Liberties of England*.

King John thought himself more injured by letting his subjects enjoy their birth-rights in virtue of this charter, than when he degraded himself to be a subject of Rome. He complained of this grant as the greatest
affront

affro
what
the r
of an
sief, f
and a
king's
peas
horse
only
suffici
comm
the gr
govern
And y
applic
Thi
the ki
of Eng
peers,
before
Englan
triumph
John's
vited t
politic
son Lou
Rome r
the holy
with his
presence
" the fi
" belon
" dom
" to my
After
gland, r
father, w
Innocent
son, but
Vol. I

affront that could be done to his dignity; yet after all, what is there in it that can be said to be injurious to the royal authority? For instance, that at the death of an earl, his eldest son to enter into possession of the fief, should pay to the king one hundred marks of silver, and a baron one hundred shillings: that none of the king's bailiffs should take the horses belonging to peasants, without paying five-pence a day for each horse? Whoever reads the whole charter through, will only find that the rights of mankind have not been sufficiently secured: he will be convinced that the commons, who bore the greatest burden, and rendered the greatest services to the state, had no share in this government, which without them could never flourish. And yet John complained of this as a hardship, and applied for redress to his new sovereign the pope.

This pope Innocent III. who had excommunicated the king, now proceeded to excommunicate the peers of England. This outrageous step so provoked the peers, that they did the very same thing as the pontiff before had done; they offered, in short, the crown of England to France. Philip Augustus, who had lately triumphed over Germany, and was now possessed of all John's demesnes in France, upon seeing himself invited to the crown of England, acted like an able politician: he prevailed on the English to demand his son Louis for their king. In vain did the legates of Rome represent to Philip that John was a feudatory of the holy see; Louis having concerted matters privately with his father, thus addressed himself to him in the presence of the legate: "Sir, I am your vassal for the fiefs I hold of you in France; but it does not belong to you to determine what concerns the kingdom of England; and if you interfere, I shall appeal to my peers."

After having made this speech, he set out for England, notwithstanding the public prohibitions of his father, who privately supplied him with men and money. Innocent III. excommunicated both the father and the son, but to no purpose, for the French bishops declared

compass his end. Not one knight was killed in the battle, except William Longchamp, who unluckily died of a blow on the eye levelled through the visier of his helmet.

Among the Germans were reckoned five and twenty knights bannerets, and seven counts of the empire, prisoners, but not one of them was wounded.

The emperor Otho lost the battle, in which 30,000 Germans were said to have been slain; but the number was probably exaggerated. We do not find, however, that the king of France made any conquest on the side of Germany after the victory obtained at Bouvines; but he acquired a greater influence over his vassals.

The person who lost most by this battle was John, king of England, whose last hopes were centered in the emperor Otho. This emperor soon after, in 1218, died in a state of penitence: it is said, that he used to order his scullions to trample upon him, and to suffer himself to be scourged by the monks, according to the opinion of the princes of that time, who believed that by this kind of discipline they could atone for the blood of so many thousands.

It is not true, as so many writers have asserted, that Philip, on the very day he gained the battle of Bouvines, received also the news of another victory obtained by his son Louis VIII. over king John. On the contrary, John had been rather successful in Poitou; but being abandoned by his allies, he concluded a truce with Philip. This truce was of great use to him, for his English subjects were become his most inveterate enemies, and treated him with the utmost contempt, because he had made himself the vassal of Rome. The barons compelled him to sign that famous
1215 charter, called *Magna Charta*, or *the Charter of the Liberties of England*.

King John thought himself more injured by letting his subjects enjoy their birth-rights in virtue of this charter, than when he degraded himself to be a subject of Rome. He complained of this grant as the greatest affront

affro
wha
the r
of an
fief, f
and a
king'
peas
horse
only
suffici
comm
the gr
govern
And y
applic
This
the kin
of Eng
peers,
before
Englan
triumph
John's
vited t
politic
son Lou
Rome r
the holy
with his
presence
" the fi
" belong
" dom
" to my
After
gland, n
father, w
Innocent
son, but
VOL. I

affront that could be done to his dignity ; yet after all, what is there in it that can be said to be injurious to the royal authority ? For instance, that at the death of an earl, his eldest son to enter into possession of the fief, should pay to the king one hundred marks of silver, and a baron one hundred shillings : that none of the king's bailiffs should take the horses belonging to peasants, without paying five-pence a day for each horse ? Whoever reads the whole charter through, will only find that the rights of mankind have not been sufficiently secured : he will be convinced that the commons, who bore the greatest burden, and rendered the greatest services to the state, had no share in this government, which without them could never flourish. And yet John complained of this as a hardship, and applied for redress to his new sovereign the pope.

This pope Innocent III. who had excommunicated the king, now proceeded to excommunicate the peers of England. This outrageous step so provoked the peers, that they did the very same thing as the pontiff before had done ; they offered, in short, the crown of England to France. Philip Augustus, who had lately triumphed over Germany, and was now possessed of all John's demesnes in France, upon seeing himself invited to the crown of England, acted like an able politician : he prevailed on the English to demand his son Louis for their king. In vain did the legates of Rome represent to Philip that John was a feudatory of the holy see ; Louis having concerted matters privately with his father, thus addressed himself to him in the presence of the legate : " Sir, I am your vassal for " the fiefs I hold of you in France ; but it does not " belong to you to determine what concerns the king- " dom of England ; and if you interfere, I shall appeal " to my peers."

After having made this speech, he set out for England, notwithstanding the public prohibitions of his father, who privately supplied him with men and money. Innocent III. excommunicated both the father and the son, but to no purpose, for the French bishops declared

the excommunication against the father void. It is observable however, that they did not dare to invalidate that of Louis; which was acknowledging, that the pope had a right to excommunicate princes. They could not dispute this power of the pope because they assumed it themselves; but they reserved to themselves the right of deciding, whether the pope's excommunication was just or not. Princes in those days were extremely unhappy, being for ever exposed to excommunications both at home and at Rome. But the people were still more wretched: the anathema fell always upon their heads, and by the hard fate of war they were impoverished and distressed.

The son of Philip Augustus was solemnly proclaimed king in London; yet he did not omit sending ambassadors to plead his cause before the pope. The pontiff
1216 had the honour, which the Roman senate formerly enjoyed, of being the judge of kings: but he died before he passed his definitive sentence.

John Lackland, wandering from town to town in his own country, died about the same time, deserted by all the world, in a village of the county of Norfolk. A peer of France had formerly conquered England, and kept possession of it: yet a king of France could not keep it.

Louis VIII. after the death of king John, was obliged, even while Philip Augustus was living, to quit this same country which had invited him to be their king; and instead of maintaining himself upon the throne, he engaged in the crusade then carrying on against the Albigenfes, who at that time were slaughtered in obedience to a decree of the see of Rome.

Louis reigned only a single year in England. The people in England, who had a liking to Henry, afterwards Henry III. obliged Louis to restore to that prince the crown which he had taken from his father John. Thus Louis was only made use of by them as a scourge to chastise a monarch who had displeased them. The pope's legate, who was then in London, dictated the terms on which Louis was to quit the kingdom. This

legate

lega
keep
decr
payi
his r
and
Fran
whic
to ap
at th
shirts
to be
actua
Th
an ab
suffer
the n
not b
Philip
Norm
lands
of lon
In
belong
There
during
But
deserv
pence
kingd
the on
and it
use of
name
other
king b
hundre
left, o
of Cass
I after

legate having excommunicated him for presuming to keep possession of the throne against his holiness's decrees, obliged him to do penance for the same, by paying to the court of Rome a tenth of two years of his revenue. His officers were taxed at a twentieth, and his chaplains, who had come with him out of France, were obliged to go to Rome to ask absolution, which they did; and were ordered, as a punishment, to appear at the door of the cathedral church of Paris, at the four great festivals, barefooted, and in their shirts, with each a rod in his hand, with which he was to be flogged by the canons. We are told that they actually performed a part of this penance.

This incredible scene was transacted in the reign of an able and courageous king, Philip Augustus, who suffered this indignity to be put upon his own son and the nation; so that the conqueror of Bouvines could not be said to have ended his career with glory. Philip left his territories increased by the accession of¹²²³ Normandy, Maine, and Poitou; but the rest of the lands belonging to England were defended by a number of lords.

In the time of Louis VIII. one part of Guienne belonged to the French and the other to the English. There happened nothing very remarkable or decisive during the whole of that reign.

But the will of Louis VIII. made in 1225, well deserves our attention. He bequeaths an hundred pence to each of the two thousand lazarettos in his kingdom. This leprous infection seems to have been the only fruit the Christians reaped from the crusades: and it was without doubt greatly increased by the little use of linen, and by the nastiness of the people. The name of Lazaretto was not applied indiscriminately to other hospitals; for we find by the same will, that the king bequeaths a hundred livres current money to two hundred hospitals. The legacy which this same king left, of 30,000 livres to his wife, the celebrated queen of Castile, amounted to 540,000 livres present money. I often touch upon this subject of the valuation

of money; because I look upon it as the pulse of the state, and the surest way of knowing its strength. For example, it is evident that Philip Augustus was the most powerful prince in his time, if independently of the jewels he left behind him, the sums specified in his will amount to near 900,000 marks of eight ounces, which are equivalent to forty-five millions present money, reckoning the mark at fifty livres. But there must be some mistake in that will: it is not at all probable that a king of France, who had no other revenue than from his private demesnes, could leave so vast a sum behind him. At that time the power of the several kings in Europe consisted in leading a great number of vassals into the field, not in possessing treasures sufficient to enslave them.

This is the proper place to controvert a strange story which has been related by all our historians. They tell us, that during the last illness of Louis VIII. his physicians were of opinion that the use of women would be the only means of saving his life; that accordingly, a young girl was conveyed into bed to him, but that the king chusing rather to die than commit a mortal sin, drove the damsel away. Father Daniel has given a copper-plate of this adventure in his history of France, considering it as the most glorious action of that prince.

This fable has been applied to several other monarchs, and like all the other tales of those times, is the pure effect of ignorance. It is now well known that the use of women is by no means a remedy for sickness; and after all, if Louis VIII. could not have recovered by any other means, there was Blanche his queen, who was very beautiful, and of course able to save his life. Father Daniel insists that Louis made a truly noble exit, by resisting his passions, and fighting against the heretics. It is true, that a little before his death, he went into Languedoc to take possession of part of the country of Toulouse, which young Amauri, count of Montfort, son to the usurper of that name, had sold to him. But can it be said, that

buying

buyin
to it
standi
refute

Of the
Pop
again
ribu

T
the th
Lackla
of Joh
out of
reigned
say, th
genes,
derick
German
quarrel
the fact
between
quillity
This
Philip,
IV. had
that tim
France;
lands w
possessed
claim t
so long
cities b
were bu
German

buying a country of a person, who had no legal right to it, was fighting for the faith? A man of understanding who reads history, has little else to do than to refute it.

C H A P. LII.

Of the Emperor Frederick II.—Of his Quarrels with the Popes.—Of the German Empire.—Of the Accusations against Frederick II.—Of the Book de Tribus Impostoribus, and of the General Council at Lyons.

TOWARDS the beginning of the thirteenth century, while Philip Augustus was still upon the throne; while Louis VIII. was stripping John Lackland of his dominions; and when, after the death of John and Philip Augustus, Louis VIII. was driven out of England, which he left to Henry III. and reigned peaceably himself in France; all this time, I say, the crusades, and the persecution of the Albigenses, were exhausting Europe. The emperor Frederick II. employed himself in healing the wounds of Germany and Italy, which were not well closed. The quarrel about the imperial crown and the Roman mitre, the factions of the Guelfs and Gibelins, and the aversion between the Germans and Italians, disturbed the tranquillity of Europe more than ever.

This Frederick II. son of Henry VI. and nephew of Philip, enjoyed the empire which his competitor Otho IV. had resigned before his death. The emperors at that time were much more powerful than the kings of France; for besides Swabia, and the other extensive lands which Frederick had in Germany, he was also possessed of Naples and Sicily by inheritance. His claim to Lombardy was founded on its having been so long in the possession of the emperors; but the Italian cities being at that time zealous for their liberties, were but little disposed to regard the pretensions of the German Cæsars. Germany was in a state of anarchy and

and confusion, which lasted a considerable time. So great was this anarchy, that the nobility reckoned it one of their privileges to rob upon the highway in their own territories, and to coin false money. Frederick II. obliged them, at the diet of Egra in 1219, to swear they would cease to exercise those privileges: and to set them an example, he relinquished the right, which had been claimed by his predecessors, of seizing on all the effects of bishops at their decease. A species of rapine which at that time prevailed in every country, and even in England.

The most barbarous and ridiculous customs obtained in those days. The great lords had taken it into their heads to establish a right of *prelibation*, which consisted in lying the first night with the new married wives of their plebeian vassals. Bishops and abbots had also this right in the quality of free barons, and some of them made their subjects in the last century purchase the renunciation of this extraordinary privilege, which prevailed in Scotland, Lombardy, Germany and France. Such were the prevailing manners at the time of the crusades.

Italy was less barbarous, but not less unhappy; the quarrels between the church and the empire had been productive of the factions of Guelfs and Gibelins, into which the several towns and families were divided.

Milan, Brescia, Mantua, Vicenza, Padua, Treviso, Ferrara, and almost all the cities of Romania under the protection of the pope, had entered into a confederacy against the emperor.

Cremona, Bergamo, Modena, Parma, Reggio, Trent, were of the Imperial party; and a great many other towns were divided between the factions of the Guelfs and Gibelins*. Thus Italy was become the theatre not of one war only, but of a hundred civil

* The Gibelins was the name given to the Imperialists. They who opposed the emperors were called Guelfs. The origin of these terms is uncertain. T.

wars
inhab
raised
Fr
agree
nor t
absen
was t
alone
the fe
the p
violence
arms.
Ho
withst
war in
times,
of per
think
throug
voyage
Greg
tom.
crusade
against
peace w
against
his own
Jerusalem
the bad
emperor
crosses f
Greg
cite Hen
against
Urban
Henry I
seized on
at the fa
perpetua

wars, which by inflaming the minds and passions of the inhabitants, did not a little tend to accustom the newly raised powers of Italy to poisoning and assassinations.

Frederick II. who was born in Italy, was fond of that agreeable country, and could bear neither the climate nor the manners of Germany, from whence he had been absent fifteen years. It is evident that his grand design was to restore the throne of the Cæsars in Italy. This alone might have changed the face of Europe: this was the secret source of all the quarrels between him and the popes. He by turns had recourse to artifice and violence, and the holy see fought him with the same arms.

Honorius III. and Gregory IX. had no other way to withstand him at first, than by sending him to wage war in the Holy Land. Such was the prejudice of the times, that the emperor was obliged to make a vow¹²²⁸ of performing this expedition, lest the people should think he was not a Christian. He made this vow through policy, and through policy he deferred the voyage.

Gregory IX. excommunicated him according to custom. Frederick sat out, and while he was making a crusade at Jerusalem, the pope was raising a faction against him at Rome. The emperor after concluding a peace with the sultan, came back to Europe to fight against the holy see. In the district of Capua he found his own father-in-law John of Brienne, titular king of Jerusalem, at the head of the pope's troops, who wore the badge of St. Peter's keys on their shoulders. The emperor's Gibelins wore the sign of the cross; and the crosses soon put the keys to flight.

Gregory IX. had no other resource left than to incite Henry king of the Romans, son of Frederick II. against his father, in the same manner as Gregory VII. Urban II. and Paschal II. had armed the sons of Henry IV. But Frederick more fortunate than Henry,¹²³⁵ seized on his rebellious son, caused him to be deposed at the famous diet of Mentz, and condemned him to perpetual imprisonment.

It was easier for Frederick to obtain the condemnation of his son at a German diet, than to raise money and troops at that assembly for the conquest of Italy. He was always powerful enough to make it the seat of war, but was never sufficiently so to subdue it. The Guelfs, who were attached to the popes, and still more to their liberties, were always able to counter-balance the power of the Gibelins who adhered to the emperor.

Sardinia was likewise a subject of dispute between the empire and the church, and consequently the subject of excommunications. The emperor, in 1138, made himself master of almost the whole island: and then Gregory IX. publicly accused Frederick II. of not believing in Jesus Christ. "We have proofs," said he in his circular letter, dated the 1st of July, 1239, "that he has publicly declared, how the world has "been imposed upon by three impostors, Moses, Jesus "Christ and Mahomet. But he places Jesus Christ far "beneath the other two; for he says, that they lived in "a state of splendor, whereas Christ was one of the "dregs of the people, who preached only to such as "himself. The emperor, continues he, maintains, "that the one only God, creator of the universe, could "not be born of a woman, and especially of a "virgin."

These heavy charges, which had nothing to do with Sardinia, did not hinder the emperor from keeping possession of that island. The quarrels between Frederick and the holy see did not interfere at all with religion; and yet the popes excommunicated that prince, published crusades against him, and deposed him. A certain cardinal, named James, who was bishop of Palestine, brought letters with him into France from this pope Gregory to the young king Louis IX. whereby his holiness having deposed Frederick II. by his own authority, transferred the imperial diadem to Robert count of Artois, brother of the French king. He had pitched upon a wrong time for this embassy, for France and England were then at war, and the French barons were up in arms in the minority of Louis. They are said

said
king
the
answ
N
cust
in re
H
the a
was
"C
"te
"be
"Al
"tic
"fro
TH
was
him t
him,
perm
himse
and p
but h
receiv
sent o
king
but th
had b
his en
He d
at any
John
Inne
assemb
which
Vatica
first of
church,
VOL

said to have given for answer, that the brother of a king of France had no need of the empire, and that the pope had less religion than Frederick II. Such an answer is too improbable to be true.

Nothing can give us a clearer idea of the manners and customs of that time, than a relation of what passed in regard to this proposal of the pope.

He addressed himself in these words to the monks of the abbey of Citeaux, whither he knew that St. Louis was going in pilgrimage, in company with his mother :
 “ Conjure the king to take the pope under his protection against that son of Satan, Frederick : It will
 “ be right for him to receive me into his kingdom, as
 “ Alexander III. was sheltered there from the persecution of Frederick I. and St. Thomas of Canterbury
 “ from that of Henry II. king of England.”

The king accordingly went to Citeaux, where he was received by five hundred monks, who conducted him to the choir. There they all kneeled down before him, and with their hands joined begged of him to permit the pope to come into France. Louis placed himself in the same kneeling posture before the monks, and promised them that he would defend the church ; but he told them also in plain terms, that he could not receive the pope into his dominions without the consent of the barons of the kingdom, by whose advice a king of France ought to be directed. Gregory died ; but the spirit of Rome is immortal. Innocent IV. who had been Frederick's friend, while cardinal, became his enemy of course, when raised to the pontificate. He deemed it necessary to weaken the imperial power at any rate, and to repair the mistake committed by John XII. in calling the Germans into Italy.

Innocent IV. after several fruitless negotiations, assembled the famous council of Lyons, concerning¹²⁵⁴ which the following inscription is still preserved in the Vatican library : *The thirteenth general council, and the first of Lyons ; Frederick II. is there declared an enemy to the church, and deprived of the imperial crown.*

It seems to have been a very bold step to depose an emperor in an imperial city; but Lyons at that time was under the protection of France; and its archbishops had usurped the prerogatives of sovereignty. Frederick II. did not neglect to send ambassadors to defend his cause at this council, where he was to be publicly accused.

The pope, who had set himself up as judge at the head of this council, acted also the part of his own advocate; and after having strongly insisted on his right to the temporalities of Naples and Sicily, and to the patrimony of the countess Matilda, he charged Frederick with having made a peace with the Mahometans; with having had Mahometan concubines; with not believing in Jesus Christ, and, in a word, with being a heretic. But how is it possible to be a heretic and an infidel at the same time? And how came they to repeat such accusations so often in those days? The popes John XII. Stephen VIII. and the emperors Frederick I. Frederick II. the chancellor des Vignes, Manfred the usurper of Naples, and a great many more were charged with the same crime. The emperor's ambassadors harangued in his defence with great spirit and resolution, and accused the pope in their turn of having been guilty of usury and rapine. There were also ambassadors at this council from France and England: the latter complained as heavily of the pope, as the pope had done to the emperor. "You receive, said they, by
 " the means of your Italian emissaries, above 60,000
 " marks yearly out of the kingdom of England; you
 " have lately sent us a legate, who has given away all
 " the church livings to Italians. He raises excessive
 " taxes upon all the religious houses, and excommuni-
 " cates every body that complains of his extortions.
 " Let these grievances be therefore immediately re-
 " dressed, for we will no longer bear with them."

The pope blushed, and made no answer, but proceeded to pronounce sentence against the emperor, by which he deprived him of his crown. It is very remarkable, that he pronounced this sentence, not, said he,

he, v
 cou
 hand
 extin
 the m
 W
 the p
 All o
 them
 propo
 was d
 tell th
 church
 Meop
 of th
 spoke
 was fu
 Fre
 Rome
 then a
 of Sav
 marqu
 was br
 crown,
 " hav
 " strip
 not fai
 Europ
 des Vig
 book d
 " not
 " have
 " last
 " hypo
 " bound
 " to m
 " disco
 " aban
 " with
 " their

he, with the approbation, but in the presence of the council. All the fathers held lighted tapers in their hands while the pope pronounced the sentence, and then extinguished them. One party signed the decree, and the rest went out, giving vent to their groans.

We must not omit to mention, that in this council the pope demanded a subsidy from all the ecclesiastics. All of them preserved a profound silence; not one of them ventured to speak either to approve or reject the proposal, except an Englishman, named Meopham, who was dean of Lincoln. This man had the courage to tell the pope that too much had been extorted from the church already. The pontiff immediately degraded Meopham by his own authority alone, and all the rest of the clergy were silent. Innocent IV. therefore spoke and acted as the sovereign of the church, and was suffered so to do.

Frederick II. however, did not allow the bishop of Rome to be the sovereign of kings. That emperor was then at Turin, which did not yet belong to the house of Savoy, being a fief of the empire, governed by the marquis of Suza. He called for his strong box, which was brought to him, and then he took out the imperial crown, saying, "Neither the pope nor his council
" have been able to take this from me, and before they
" strip me of it, much blood shall be spilt." He did not fail first to write to all the princes of Germany and Europe, by the pen of his celebrated chancellor Peter des Vignes, who was accused of having composed the book *de Tribus Impostoribus*, or *the Three Impostors*. "I am
" not the first, says he in his letters, whom the clergy
" have treated so unworthily, and I shall not be the
" last: but you are the cause of it by obeying these
" hypocrites, whose ambition, you are sensible, is
" boundless. How many infamous actions, shocking
" to modesty, might you, if you were disposed to it,
" discover in the court of Rome? While they are
" abandoned to the vices of the age, and intoxicated
" with pleasure, the greatness of their riches stifles in
" their minds all sense of religion. It will therefore

A a a 2

" be

“ be a work of charity to deprive them of these pernicious treasures that are their ruin, and to this end it is your duty to labour with me, &c.”

In the mean time, the pope having declared the empire vacant, wrote to seven princes or bishops, who were the dukes of Bavaria, Saxony, Austria and Brabant, and the archbishops of Saltzbourg, Cologne and Mentz. This has given rise to a belief, that seven electors were then solemnly established: but the other princes of the empire, and the other bishops, also laid claim to the same right.

The emperors and popes thus mutually endeavoured to depose each other, and their grand policy consisted in exciting civil wars.

Conrad, the son of Frederick II. had been already elected king of the Romans in Germany; but in order to please the pope, it was necessary to chuse another emperor. This new Cæsar was neither elected by the dukes of Saxony, Brabant, Bavaria or Austria, nor by any of the princes of the empire: but by the bishops of Strasbourg, Wurtzburg, Spire and Metz, with those of Mentz, Cologne and Treves; who made choice of the landgrave of Thuringia, stiled *King of the Priests*.

What a strange kind of a Roman emperor was this landgrave, who received the crown only from a few bishops of his own country! The pope caused the crusade to be renewed against Frederick; and it was proclaimed by the preaching friars, now called Dominicans, and the friars minors, called the Cordeliers or Franciscans; for this new militia of the popes was now beginning to be established in Europe. The holy see did not confine itself however to these measures; for the pope carried on conspiracies against the life of an emperor, who had the boldness to oppose councils, monks and crusades; at least, the emperor complained, that the pope had hired assassins to murder him, and the pope returned no answer to these complaints.

The same prelates, who had taken the liberty to make a Cæsar, raised up another after the death of
their

their
The
only
who
and t
Fr
the e
is fai
physi
poiso
doubt
cient
Fre
to tru
home
even
Manfi
his lat
It is c
peror,
worn
salem,
procla
fifty-se
the wo
at his
trouble
civilize
towns,
vived
which
was be
are for
guage.
judicial
From
German
manner
German
for Ger

their Thuringian, and this was a count of Holland. The pretensions of Germany to the Roman empire only served to tear it in pieces: for these bishops, who elected emperors, quarrelled amongst themselves, and their count of Holland was killed in the civil war.

Frederick II. had to struggle with the popes from the extremity of Sicily, even to that of Germany. It 1249 is said, that being in Apulia, he discovered that his physician had been tempted by pope Innocent IV. to poison him. The fact however, appears to me to be doubtful; but the doubts raised by history, are sufficient to convince us of the iniquity of those times.

Frederick seeing with horror that it was impossible to trust his life to Christians, was obliged to take Mahometans for his guard; and yet we are told, that even these could not secure him from the resentment of Manfred, one of his bastards, who strangled him in his last illness. This assertion likewise is probably false. It is certain however, that this great and unhappy emperor, who was king of Sicily from his cradle, having worn for thirty-eight years the empty crown of Jerusalem, and that of the Cæsars fifty-four, (having been 1250 proclaimed king of the Romans in 1196) died in his fifty-seventh year, in the kingdom of Naples, and left the world in as great confusion at his death as it was at his birth. Notwithstanding such a multitude of troubles, the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily were civilized and embellished through his care. He built towns, founded universities, and in some measure revived a taste for literature. The Italian language, which is a compound of the Roman and Latin tongues, was beginning to be formed about that time. There are some verses of Frederick II. extant in that language. But the difficulties he underwent, were as prejudicial to learning, as to his political designs.

From the death of Frederick II. to the year 1268, Germany was without a head; but not in the same manner as Greece had been, or ancient Gaul, or ancient Germany, or Italy, before it submitted to the Romans: for Germany was neither a republic, nor a country divided

vided among many sovereigns, but a body without a head, whose members tore each other in pieces.

This was a fine opportunity for the popes; but they were so far from taking advantage of it, that they lost Brescia, Cremona, Mantua, and several small cities.

A warlike pope was then wanting to recover them; but Rome had seldom a pope of this character. They indeed made the world tremble with their bulls, and gave away kingdoms upon parchment. (The pope, in 1247, proclaimed, by his own authority, Haquin, king of Norway, declaring him to be lawfully begotten, though he was born a bastard;) he was crowned by the pope's legate, who received of him a tribute of 15,000 marks from the churches of Norway, which was, perhaps, half of the current money of so poor a country.

1251 The same pope Innocent IV. also created one Mando, king of Lithuania; but he was only a king depending on Rome. *We receive*, said he in a bull dated the 15th of July, 1251, *this new kingdom of Lithuania, as the right and property of St. Peter, taking you under our protection, you, your wife, and children.* This was in some measure imitating the grandeur of the ancient senate of Rome, who granted titles of kings and tetrarchs. Yet Lithuania was not then a kingdom; it did not even embrace Christianity till above a century after.

The popes therefore assumed the stile of masters of the world, and yet could not act as masters at home: it cost them only paper to dispose of kingdoms and states, but it was only by dint of intrigues they were able to recover a village near Mantua or Ferrara. If we now take a general view of the state of Europe at that time, we shall find Germany and Italy rent in pieces, France still weak, and Spain divided between the Christians and Mussulmen, the latter having been entirely driven out of Italy; England began to struggle with its kings for liberty; feudal tenures every where established; chivalry in fashion, priests become princes and warriors, and the principles of government almost wholly different from those which animate Europe at present.

All

All
ed to
and t
lic, t
projec
variet
new k
and in

Of the

R
the en
coman
to fear
same a
were o
Turks
Taurus
said, fr
among
Scythia
four tin
bited b
have p
of a reg
country
their in
century
and alon
Arabian
dued al
Turcom
A cal
tassem,

All the countries under the Roman communion, seemed to form one great republic, of which the emperor and the pope wanted to be the head: and this republic, though divided, agreed for a long time in the project of the crusades, which gave rise to so great a variety of great and infamous actions, and produced new kingdoms, new establishments, new misfortunes, and in a word more unhappiness than glory.

C H A P. LIII.

Of the East at the Time of the Crusades, and of the State of Palestine.

RELIGIONS always last longer than empires. Mahometanism continued to flourish although the empire of the caliphs was destroyed by the Turcomans. We fatigue ourselves to no purpose, in order to search into the origin of these Turks, since it is the same as that of all conquering nations; all of whom were originally savages and subsisted by rapine. The Turks formerly inhabited a country beyond mount Taurus and the Immaus, and at a great distance, it is said, from the river Araxes: they were comprehended amongst those Tartars, who by the ancients were called Scythians. This vast continent of Tartary, which is four times larger than all Europe, has never been inhabited by any but barbarians: and their antiquities have perhaps no better claim to be made the subjects of a regular history than the wolves and tygers of their country. These northern nations have in all ages made their incursions towards the south. In the eleventh century they spread themselves on the side of Muscovy, and along the banks of the Caspian and Black Sea. The Arabians under the first successors of Mahomet had subdued almost all Asia Minor, Syria, and Persia; and the Turcomans came at length and subdued the Arabians.

A caliph of the dynasty of the Abassides, named Motasssem, son of the great Almamon, and grandson of the

the celebrated Aaron-al-Rachild, like them a protector of the arts, and cotemporary to Louis the Weak, laid the first foundation of the structure, by which his successors at length were crushed. He called in Turkish soldiers for his guard: and never was there a stronger instance of the danger from foreign troops. Five or six hundred Turks in Motasssem's pay, laid the foundation of the Ottoman power, which has swallowed up all other governments from the banks of the Euphrates to the further end of Greece, and which in our memory laid siege to Vienna. These Turkish guards having been gradually augmented, at length proved fatal to their masters. A new succession of Turks arrived, who took advantage of the civil wars that had been occasioned by the caliphate. The caliphs of the dynasty of the Abassides of Bagdat, were soon deprived of Syria, Egypt, and Africa, by the caliphs of the dynasty of the Fatimites: and both the Fatimites [and the Abassides were stripped by the Turks.

Togrul Beg, or Ortogrul Beg, from whom the Ottoman line is said to descend, entered Bagdat in the same manner almost as several emperors entered Rome. He made himself master of the city and of the caliph's person, while he prostrated himself at his feet. He conducted the caliph Caiem to his palace, holding his mule by the bridle: but he was either more artful or more fortunate than the German emperors at Rome; for he established his own power, and left the caliphs no more than the care of beginning prayers at the mosque on Fridays, and the honour of granting the investiture to every Mahometan tyrant that erected a sovereignty.

It is worthy of observation, that as the Turcomans imitated the Franks, Normans, and Goths, in their irruptions, they imitated them likewise in submitting to the laws, the manners and religion of the conquered. Other Tartars behaved in the same manner to the Chinese; an advantage which all polite nations, though never so weak, ought to have over barbarians, though never so strong.

Thus the caliphs became only the chiefs of religion, like the Dairi, who is the high priest of Japan, and who in reality is subject to the Cubosama, though he commands him in appearance; or like the sheriff of Mecca who styles the sultan of Turkey his vicar; or in short, like the popes under the kings of Lombardy. I am not making a comparison however between the Mahometan and Christian religions; I am only comparing the revolutions. I cannot help remarking that the caliphs were the most potent sovereigns in the East, at the time when the Roman pontiffs were nothing. The caliphate is sunk for ever; but the popes are insensibly become great sovereigns, settled in their dominions, respected by their neighbours, and have embellished Rome so as to make it the finest city in the world.

Therefore at the time of the first crusade there was at Bagdat a caliph who gave investitures, and a Turkish sultan who had the real sovereignty. Several other Turkish, and some Arabian usurpers were dispersed in Persia, Arabia, and Asia Minor. They were all divided, and from these divisions the crusaders might have expected success. But they were all armed, and upon their own ground; a circumstance which gave them a considerable advantage.

The empire of Constantinople still subsisted, for all its princes had not been unworthy of the throne. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, the son of Leo the Philosopher, and who was himself a philosopher, distinguished his reign, as his father had done, by contributing to the felicity of his people; and though the government fell into contempt under Romanus the son of Constantine, it regained its respect and influence under Nicephorus Phocas, who recovered Candia in the year 961, before he became emperor. He was assassinated however by John Zimisces; who notwithstanding his having stained the palace with blood, and his adding hypocrisy to his guilt, defended the empire against the Turks and Bulgarians. But in the reign of Michael Paphloganatus the empire was deprived of Sicily, and under Romanus Diogenes it lost almost all that remained

in the East, except the province of Pontus. That province, which is now called Turcomania, fell soon after into the hands of Solyman the Turk; who, already master of the greatest part of Asia Minor, established the seat of his dominion at Nicea, and from thence threatened Constantinople, at the very time the crusades were commencing.

The Grecian empire therefore, on the side of the Turks, was then almost confined to the Imperial city; but it still extended through all Greece, Macedonia, Thrace, Illyrica, Epirus; and even the isle of Candia was included in it. Continual, though always unsuccessful wars against the Turks, still kept up some remains of courage amongst the Greeks. All the rich Christians of Asia, who were unwilling to submit to the Mahometan yoke, retired into the Imperial city, which by that means was enriched with the spoils of the provinces. In short, notwithstanding so many losses, notwithstanding the vices and revolutions in the government, that city, declining indeed, but immense, populous, opulent, and voluptuous, still considered itself as the first city in the world. The inhabitants called themselves Romans, and not Greeks; their state was the Roman empire; and the people in the West, whom they called Latins, were in their opinion barbarians, who had revolted from them.

Palestine was then, what it is at present, the worst of all the inhabited countries in Asia. This little district, which is about forty-five leagues in length, and from thirty to thirty-five in breadth, is almost covered with barren rocks, on which there is not a handful of earth. If this little province was cultivated, we might compare it to Switzerland. The river Jordan, which in the middle of its course is not above fifty feet wide, resembles the Aar, which flows through a valley less barren than the rest of Switzerland: but the sea of Tiberias is not comparable to the lake of Geneva. The most intelligent travellers, however, who have carefully visited both Switzerland and Palestine, all agree in giving the preference to the former.

3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12. 13. 14. 15. 16. 17. 18. 19. 20. 21. 22. 23. 24. 25. 26. 27. 28. 29. 30. 31. 32. 33. 34. 35. 36. 37. 38. 39. 40. 41. 42. 43. 44. 45. 46. 47. 48. 49. 50. 51. 52. 53. 54. 55. 56. 57. 58. 59. 60. 61. 62. 63. 64. 65. 66. 67. 68. 69. 70. 71. 72. 73. 74. 75. 76. 77. 78. 79. 80. 81. 82. 83. 84. 85. 86. 87. 88. 89. 90. 91. 92. 93. 94. 95. 96. 97. 98. 99. 100. 101. 102. 103. 104. 105. 106. 107. 108. 109. 110. 111. 112. 113. 114. 115. 116. 117. 118. 119. 120. 121. 122. 123. 124. 125. 126. 127. 128. 129. 130. 131. 132. 133. 134. 135. 136. 137. 138. 139. 140. 141. 142. 143. 144. 145. 146. 147. 148. 149. 150. 151. 152. 153. 154. 155. 156. 157. 158. 159. 160. 161. 162. 163. 164. 165. 166. 167. 168. 169. 170. 171. 172. 173. 174. 175. 176. 177. 178. 179. 180. 181. 182. 183. 184. 185. 186. 187. 188. 189. 190. 191. 192. 193. 194. 195. 196. 197. 198. 199. 200. 201. 202. 203. 204. 205. 206. 207. 208. 209. 210. 211. 212. 213. 214. 215. 216. 217. 218. 219. 220. 221. 222. 223. 224. 225. 226. 227. 228. 229. 230. 231. 232. 233. 234. 235. 236. 237. 238. 239. 240. 241. 242. 243. 244. 245. 246. 247. 248. 249. 250. 251. 252. 253. 254. 255. 256. 257. 258. 259. 260. 261. 262. 263. 264. 265. 266. 267. 268. 269. 270. 271. 272. 273. 274. 275. 276. 277. 278. 279. 280. 281. 282. 283. 284. 285. 286. 287. 288. 289. 290. 291. 292. 293. 294. 295. 296. 297. 298. 299. 300. 301. 302. 303. 304. 305. 306. 307. 308. 309. 310. 311. 312. 313. 314. 315. 316. 317. 318. 319. 320. 321. 322. 323. 324. 325. 326. 327. 328. 329. 330. 331. 332. 333. 334. 335. 336. 337. 338. 339. 340. 341. 342. 343. 344. 345. 346. 347. 348. 349. 350. 351. 352. 353. 354. 355. 356. 357. 358. 359. 360. 361. 362. 363. 364. 365. 366. 367. 368. 369. 370. 371. 372. 373. 374. 375. 376. 377. 378. 379. 380. 381. 382. 383. 384. 385. 386. 387. 388. 389. 390. 391. 392. 393. 394. 395. 396. 397. 398. 399. 400. 401. 402. 403. 404. 405. 406. 407. 408. 409. 410. 411. 412. 413. 414. 415. 416. 417. 418. 419. 420. 421. 422. 423. 424. 425. 426. 427. 428. 429. 430. 431. 432. 433. 434. 435. 436. 437. 438. 439. 440. 441. 442. 443. 444. 445. 446. 447. 448. 449. 450. 451. 452. 453. 454. 455. 456. 457. 458. 459. 460. 461. 462. 463. 464. 465. 466. 467. 468. 469. 470. 471. 472. 473. 474. 475. 476. 477. 478. 479. 480. 481. 482. 483. 484. 485. 486. 487. 488. 489. 490. 491. 492. 493. 494. 495. 496. 497. 498. 499. 500. 501. 502. 503. 504. 505. 506. 507. 508. 509. 510. 511. 512. 513. 514. 515. 516. 517. 518. 519. 520. 521. 522. 523. 524. 525. 526. 527. 528. 529. 530. 531. 532. 533. 534. 535. 536. 537. 538. 539. 540. 541. 542. 543. 544. 545. 546. 547. 548. 549. 550. 551. 552. 553. 554. 555. 556. 557. 558. 559. 560. 561. 562. 563. 564. 565. 566. 567. 568. 569. 570. 571. 572. 573. 574. 575. 576. 577. 578. 579. 580. 581. 582. 583. 584. 585. 586. 587. 588. 589. 590. 591. 592. 593. 594. 595. 596. 597. 598. 599. 600. 601. 602. 603. 604. 605. 606. 607. 608. 609. 610. 611. 612. 613. 614. 615. 616. 617. 618. 619. 620. 621. 622. 623. 624. 625. 626. 627. 628. 629. 630. 631. 632. 633. 634. 635. 636. 637. 638. 639. 640. 641. 642. 643. 644. 645. 646. 647. 648. 649. 650. 651. 652. 653. 654. 655. 656. 657. 658. 659. 660. 661. 662. 663. 664. 665. 666. 667. 668. 669. 670. 671. 672. 673. 674. 675. 676. 677. 678. 679. 680. 681. 682. 683. 684. 685. 686. 687. 688. 689. 690. 691. 692. 693. 694. 695. 696. 697. 698. 699. 700. 701. 702. 703. 704. 705. 706. 707. 708. 709. 710. 711. 712. 713. 714. 715. 716. 717. 718. 719. 720. 721. 722. 723. 724. 725. 726. 727. 728. 729. 730. 731. 732. 733. 734. 735. 736. 737. 738. 739. 740. 741. 742. 743. 744. 745. 746. 747. 748. 749. 750. 751. 752. 753. 754. 755. 756. 757. 758. 759. 760. 761. 762. 763. 764. 765. 766. 767. 768. 769. 770. 771. 772. 773. 774. 775. 776. 777. 778. 779. 780. 781. 782. 783. 784. 785. 786. 787. 788. 789. 790. 791. 792. 793. 794. 795. 796. 797. 798. 799. 800. 801. 802. 803. 804. 805. 806. 807. 808. 809. 810. 811. 812. 813. 814. 815. 816. 817. 818. 819. 820. 821. 822. 823. 824. 825. 826. 827. 828. 829. 830. 831. 832. 833. 834. 835. 836. 837. 838. 839. 840. 841. 842. 843. 844. 845. 846. 847. 848. 849. 850. 851. 852. 853. 854. 855. 856. 857. 858. 859. 860. 861. 862. 863. 864. 865. 866. 867. 868. 869. 870. 871. 872. 873. 874. 875. 876. 877. 878. 879. 880. 881. 882. 883. 884. 885. 886. 887. 888. 889. 890. 891. 892. 893. 894. 895. 896. 897. 898. 899. 900. 901. 902. 903. 904. 905. 906. 907. 908. 909. 910. 911. 912. 913. 914. 915. 916. 917. 918. 919. 920. 921. 922. 923. 924. 925. 926. 927. 928. 929. 930. 931. 932. 933. 934. 935. 936. 937. 938. 939. 940. 941. 942. 943. 944. 945. 946. 947. 948. 949. 950. 951. 952. 953. 954. 955. 956. 957. 958. 959. 960. 961. 962. 963. 964. 965. 966. 967. 968. 969. 970. 971. 972. 973. 974. 975. 976. 977. 978. 979. 980. 981. 982. 983. 984. 985. 986. 987. 988. 989. 990. 991. 992. 993. 994. 995. 996. 997. 998. 999. 1000.

It is indeed probable that Judea was anciently better cultivated, when it was possessed by the Jews; for they were obliged to spread a little earth over the rocks, in order to plant their vines; and this small quantity of earth, mixed with the shivers of the rocks, was supported by low walls, the remains of which are still to be seen in many places.

All the country to the southward, towards the Mediterranean sea and Egypt, consists of sandy deserts, and from Esiongaber to the Red Sea, abounds with hideous mountains. These rocks and sands, which are now inhabited by a set of Arabian freebooters, were the ancient country of the Jews. They afterwards extended themselves a little northward into Arabia Petræa. The little country of Jericho, which they invaded, was one of the best they possessed; the soil of Jerusalem being much more dry and parched, and not having the advantage of being situated on a river. There is but very little pasturage in this country, so that the inhabitants not being able to find food for horses, are obliged to make use of asses as their only beasts of carriage. Their oxen are very poor, but sheep thrive a little better; they have olive trees in some places, which produce tolerable fruit. There are likewise some palm trees here and there; and this country, which the Jews made habitable after infinite pains and labour, when their unhappy condition allowed them to do it, was to them a paradise, in comparison with the deserts of Sina, Param, and Cades Barne.

St. Jerome, who lived so long in Bethlehem, acknowledges, that they were troubled with continual droughts in that barren, rocky, and sandy country, where it seldom rains, and where there are no springs or fountains; the want of which the natives are obliged to supply by vast cisterns, at a prodigious expence.

Palestine, notwithstanding all this care of the Hebrews, was never able to subsist its inhabitants; and

therefore, as the thirteen cantons send out the superfluity of their people to serve in the armies of those princes who are capable of paying them, the Jews all went abroad to follow the trade of brokers in different parts of Asia and Africa. Scarcely was Alexandria built, when they settled there. The trading Jews seldom resided at Jerusalem; and I question whether, in the most flourishing state of that small kingdom, any of its inhabitants were so wealthy as many of the Jews are at present at Amsterdam, the Hague, London, and Constantinople.

When Omar, one of the first successors of Mahomet, seized on the fertile country of Syria, he took Palestine; and as Jerusalem, in the opinion of the Mahometans, is a holy city, he entered into it covered with sackcloth, in the habit of a penitent, and without exacting the tax of thirteen drachms for every inhabitant, as the pontiff had directed. This is what is related by Nicetas Coniates. Omar likewise enriched Jerusalem with a magnificent mosque of marble covered with lead, and adorned within by a prodigious number of silver lamps, among which there were many of pure gold. When the Turks, who were already Mahometans, made themselves masters afterwards of this place, in 1055, they paid a respect to the mosque, and the town continued to be peopled by seven or eight thousand inhabitants. These were as many as its inclosure could hold, and the adjacent territory could well maintain. They had no other means of growing rich than by the pilgrimages of Christians and Mahometans: the latter went to visit the mosque, and the former the place in which it is pretended that Jesus Christ was interred. They all paid a small acknowledgment to the Turkish emir, who resided in the town, and to a few Imans, who subsisted by the curiosity of pilgrims.

C H A P. LIV.

Of the First Crusade, to the taking of Jerusalem.

SUCH was the state of Asia Minor, when a pilgrim of Amiens gave rise to the crusades: he had then no other name besides Coucoupetre, or Cucupietre, as we are told by the daughter of the emperor Comnenus, who saw this hermit at Constantinople; but he is known to us by the name of Peter the Hermit. This Picard, who had been on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, first induced the nations of this western world to carry their arms into the East, and occasioned millions of Europeans to perish in Asia. Thus it is with the great events of this world, which often arise from the most trifling causes. Peter had complained bitterly to the bishop, who resided in the country, with the title of patriarch of Jerusalem, of the troubles and exactions to which the pilgrims were exposed. There was no want of revelations on this occasion. William of Tyre assures us, that Jesus Christ appeared to the hermit, and said to him, "I will be with thee, for it is time to assist my servants." At his return to Rome he described these things in such pathetic terms, and in such lively colours, that pope Urban II. thought him a proper person to second the grand design the popes had for a long time formed of arming Christianity against Mahometanism; he therefore sent Peter from province to province, to communicate, by the force of his strong imagination, the warmth of his sentiments, and to sow the seeds of enthusiasm.

Soon after Urban II. held a council in the open fields near Placentia, at which were present above ¹⁰⁹⁴ thirty thousand seculars, besides ecclesiastics. There they proposed the manner of avenging the Christian cause. Alexis Comnenus, the Grecian emperor, and father of that princess who wrote the history of her times, sent ambassadors to this council to request some assistance against the Mussulmen; but he had no room
to

to expect it, either from the pope or the Italians. The Normans had then taken Naples and Sicily from the Greeks; and as the pope desired at least to be lord paramount of these kingdoms, and was moreover the rival of the Greek church, he necessarily became the declared enemy of the eastern emperors, as he was the private foe of the emperors of the West; consequently he was so far from succouring the Greeks, that he desired to have all the East subject to the Latins.

All those who assisted at the council of Placentia applauded the project of invading Palestine, but not one of them actually embraced it. The principal Italian lords had too much business of their own to manage at home, and would not leave a delightful country, in order to go and fight on the borders of Arabia Petræa.

1095 Another council was therefore held at Clermont, in Auvergne, where the pope made a speech in the market place. In Italy, the people had wept over the calamities of the Christians of Asia, but in France they were disposed to take up arms. This country was peopled by a great number of new lords, who were restless, independent, fond of a life of war and dissipation, for the most part plunged in crimes that are the natural attendants of debauchery, and in an ignorance equal to their guilt: but the pope proposed to grant them the remission of all their sins, and to open to them the gates of heaven, only imposing on them as a penance, the gratification of their predominant passion for plunder. They therefore took up the cross with a spirit of emulation; and then the churches and cloisters bought at a low rate many of the estates of the lords, who imagined that a little money and their arms were sufficient to enable them to conquer kingdoms in Asia. Thus for example, Godfrey of Bouillon, duke of Brabant, sold his estate of Bouillon to the chapter of Liege, and Stenay to the bishop of Verdun; Baldwin, Godfrey's brother, likewise sold to the same bishop the little he possessed in that country.

The

The meanest lords of manors set out at their own expence, and the poor gentlemen followed them as 'squires. The division of the spoil was to be proportioned to the rank and expences of the crusaders. This became a great source of disputes, but it was likewise a great incentive to the expedition. Religion, avarice, and a restlessness of disposition, all tended to promote these migrations. They enlisted an infinite number of infantry and horsemen under a thousand different banners. This crowd of crusaders appointed their rendezvous at Constantinople. Monks, women, merchants, victuallers, mechanics, all set out, imagining that they should find none on the road but Christians, who would gain indulgences by furnishing them with subsistence. Above eighty thousand of these vagabonds ranged themselves under the standard of Coucoupetre, whom I shall from henceforward call Peter the Hermit, who walked at the head of the army with sandals on his feet, and a rope tied round his waist. A new species of vanity!

Antiquity had never beheld an instance of emigrations from one part of the world to another, set on foot by religious enthusiasm. This epidemic madness now made its appearance for the first time, in order that there might be no scourge with which mankind had not been afflicted.

The first exploit of this hermit, was his besieging a Christian city in Hungary, called *Malavilla*, because its inhabitants had refused to supply with provisions these soldiers of Jesus Christ, who, notwithstanding the sanctity of their enterprise, behaved like a band of highway robbers. The city being taken by storm, was pillaged, and all its inhabitants massacred. The hermit was then no longer master of his crusaders, who were intoxicated with the thirst of plunder. One of Peter's lieutenants, called Gautier *sans argent*, or *lack money*, who commanded half his forces, behaved in the same manner in Bulgaria; but the country uniting to oppose these banditti, the greatest part of them were cut off, and the hermit at length appeared before

before Constantinople with twenty thousand persons dying with hunger.

A German preacher, named Godescaldus, who wanted to act in the same manner, met with still worse treatment. For as soon as he arrived with his disciples in that same Hungary, where his predecessors had committed such excesses, the red cross they wore was like a signal, at the sight of which they were all massacred.

Another horde of these adventurers, composed of above two hundred thousand persons, women, priests, scholars, and peasants, imagining that they were going to defend Jesus Christ, thought that they ought to exterminate all the Jews wherever they found them. There were great numbers of these on the frontiers of France, and the trade of the kingdom was all in their hands; these Christians therefore, in order to execute the vengeance of heaven, put all those unhappy persons to the sword: never was there since the time of Adrian so great a massacre of the people of that nation, who were exterminated at Verdun, Spire, Worms, Cologne, and Mentz; and many killed themselves after having ripped open the bellies of their wives to prevent their falling into the hands of those barbarians. Hungary, however, was the grave of this third army of crusaders.

The hermit, Peter, found before Constantinople other Italian and German vagabonds who joined him, and ravaged all the country round the city. The emperor Alexis Comnenus, who reigned at that time, was certainly a prince of great wisdom and moderation; since he contented himself with getting rid, as soon as he was able, of such troublesome guests, by furnishing them with vessels to transport them to the other side of the Bosphorus. The general Peter at length saw himself at the head of a Christian army within reach of the Mussulmen; but Solyman, sultan of Nicea, fell with his disciplined Turks on this dispersed multitude; and *Gautier sans argent*, with many of the poor nobility, were slain. The hermit, however,

ever,
garde
madr

Al
mann
comm
Peter
better
the h
cap-a
themf

In
of Fr
who l
almost
a king
appea
dy, el
left h
and af
brothe
to rais
Histor
tious
from

promp

Old
guedo
fought
in his
cient t
going
first w
the he
did no
preach

The
the or
son of
whole

VOL

ever, returned to Constantinople, where he was regarded as a fanatic, who had enlisted a multitude of madmen for his followers.

All the chiefs of the crusades did not act in the same manner. Some of them who had been accustomed to command, had more policy and less enthusiasm than Peter, and were at the head of troops that were a little better disciplined. Godfrey of Bouillon marched at the head of 70,000 foot and 10,000 cavalry, armed cap-a-pee, under the banners of many lords, who ranged themselves under his standard.

In the mean time Hugh, brother to Philip I. king of France marched through Italy, with other lords who had joined him, in order to seek his fortune; for almost the whole he possessed was his title of brother to a king, who himself was not very powerful. But what appears more strange is, that Robert duke of Normandy, eldest son of William the Conqueror of England, left his duchy, in which he was scarcely established; and after being driven out of England by his younger brother, William Rufus, mortgaged Normandy to him, to raise money to defray the expence of this armament. Historians speak of him as a voluptuous and superstitious prince; and these two qualities, which proceed from the weakness of the understanding, seem to have prompted him to this expedition.

Old Raymond, count of Toulouse, who possessed Languedoc and a part of Provence, and who had already fought against the Mussulmen in Spain, did not find either in his age, or in the interests of his country, reasons sufficient to make him suppress the ardent desire he felt for going into Palestine. He is said to have been one of the first who took up arms, and to have passed the Alps at the head of near an hundred thousand men: but he did not foresee that a crusade would very soon be preached up against his own family.

The most politic of all these crusaders, and perhaps the only politician among them, was Bohemond, the son of Robert Guiscard, the conqueror of Sicily. The whole of this Norman family, on its being transplanted

into Italy, sought to aggrandize themselves sometimes at the expence of the pope, and at others on the ruins of the Grecian empire. This Bohemond had himself for a long time maintained a war against the emperor Alexis, in Epirus and Greece; and having no other inheritance, besides the petty principality of Tarentum, and his own courage, he took the advantage of the epidemical enthusiasm of Europe, to assemble under his banner ten thousand horsemen well armed, and some infantry, with which he might conquer a few provinces either from the Christians or Mahometans.

The princess Anna Comnena observes, that her father was alarmed at these prodigious emigrations, which rushed into his country. "One would have imagined," says she, that all Europe, torn up from its foundations, was going to fall upon Asia." But what would have been the fate of that country, if the three hundred thousand men who followed the hermit Peter, and Godescaldus had not been cut off on their journey?

It was proposed to the pope to put himself at the head of those immense armies that were still left; and indeed this was the only method of arriving at universal monarchy, which was then the principal view of the court of Rome: but this enterprize required the genius of a Mahomet, or an Alexander. The difficulties were great, and Urban saw nothing but difficulties.

Gregory VII. had long before conceived the project of the crusades. He had been desirous of arming the western against the eastern empire, and was ambitious of ruling over the Greek church as well as the Latin. If his views had been completed the popes would then have seen the two empires submitted to their laws. But in the time of Gregory VII. these ideas were altogether chimerical. The empire of Constantinople was as yet not sufficiently fallen, nor had fanaticism operated so powerfully there as in the west. The minds of the people were not disposed for such an enterprize till the time of Urban II.

The popes and princes engaged in the crusades, had very different views in the expedition, and Constantinople

nor
had
(
lita
not
avo
view
all
selv
the
W
thes
the
who
pero
of C
perf
his b
"fa
"us
only
discre
natio
this c
"no
"wh
"all
"wh
"to
"ver
It
not d
Greek
and i
betwe
the fir
those t
anim
the fu
by the

nople was afraid of them all. The Latins were there hated, and considered as heretics and barbarians.

Of all these adventurers Bohemond and his Neapolitans were the most dreaded by the Greeks, and that not without reason, as they were known to be the avowed enemies of the empire. But supposing the views of Bohemond to have been just, what right had all these western princes to come and seize for themselves the provinces which the Turks had taken from the Grecian emperors?

We may form a judgment of the brutal arrogance of these lords of the crusade, from an incident related by the princess Anna Comnena of a certain French count, who in a public ceremony seated himself by the emperor's side on his throne; when Baldwin, the brother of Godfrey of Bouillon, taking hold of this indiscreet person, to make him retire, the count cried aloud in his barbarous jargon, "This Greek is a mighty pleasant clown to keep himself seated before such men as us!" These words were interpreted to Alexis, who only smiled at this instance of folly. One or two indiscretions of this kind are sufficient to render a whole nation contemptible. Alexis ordered somebody to ask this count who he was—"I am, said he, of a right noble family. I used to go every day to the church which is in my own manor, where were assembled all the brave lords who had vowed to fight duels, and who had prayed to Jesus Christ and the holy Virgin to be favorable to them; but not one of them would venture to fight with me."

It was morally impossible, that such guests should not demand provisions with arrogance, and that the Greeks should not refuse them with marks of ill nature; and indeed this was the cause of continual skirmishes between the natives and Godfrey's army, which was the first that appeared after the rapine committed by those that followed Peter the Hermit: at length these animosities were carried so far, that Godfrey attacked the suburbs of Constantinople, which were defended by the emperor in person. Monteil, bishop of Puy in

Auvergne, the pope's legate in the army of the crusade, was absolutely resolved on their beginning their enterprizes against the infidels, by laying siege to the city that was the residence of the chief of all the Christian princes: Bohemond, who was then in Sicily, gave the same advice, and sent courier after courier to prevent Godfrey's coming to an agreement with the emperor. Hugh, brother to the king of France, was at the same time so imprudent as to leave Sicily, where he had been with Bohemond, and to venture almost alone into the territories of Alexis: to this indiscretion he added, that of writing the most presumptuous letters, which was ridiculous in a man who was without an army. The result of this insolence was, his being seized and detained for some time as a prisoner. At length, by the prudent conduct of the Greek emperor, all these storms were diverted. He furnished them with provisions, prevailed on the princes engaged in the crusade to pay him homage for all the lands they should conquer, and after having loaded them with presents, transported them into Asia. Bohemond, whom he most dreaded, he treated with the greatest magnificence; for when this prince went to pay him homage at Constantinople, and was seeing the rarities of the palace, Alexis ordered that a cabinet should be filled with curiosities in gold and silver of exquisite workmanship, with jewels of all kinds heaped up without order, and that the door should be left open. Bohemond, in passing through the apartment, seeing this treasure, to which his conductors seemed to pay no attention, exclaimed with astonishment, "Is it possible that such things as these should be neglected? Were they mine, I should think myself the most powerful prince on earth." The emperor sent him the cabinet that very evening. This account is related by the emperor's daughter, who was an eye-witness of the whole affair. Such was the behaviour of this prince, whom every disinterested person will stile wise and munificent; but whom the greater part of those who have written the history of the crusades, have treated as perfidious,

only because he would not be the slave of a dangerous multitude.

At length, after the emperor had happily got rid of them, and they had all crossed over into Asia Minor, the army was reviewed near Nicea, when it was found to consist of an hundred thousand horse, and six hundred thousand foot, including the women: and this number added to the first crusaders, who perished under the hermit and others, makes the total amount to about eleven hundred thousand: a number that justifies what we are told of the armies of the kings of Persia which poured in upon Greece, and also what is related of the transplantations of such swarms of barbarians. The French, at length, and more particularly Raymond of Toulouse, now found themselves in the same country, which the southern Gauls had over-run thirteen hundred years before, when they ravaged Asia Minor, and gave their name to the province of Galatia.

Historians seldom mention the means which these immense multitudes adopted to procure subsistence; and yet this was a concern that required as much care as the war itself. The Venetians at first refused to supply them; for they at that time gained more than ever by their commerce with the Mahometans, and therefore feared to lose the privileges they enjoyed amongst them: but the Genoese, the Pisans, and the Greeks, fitted out vessels laden with provisions, which they sold to the crusaders along the coast of Asia Minor; thus the Genoese grew rich, and the world was astonished to see that state become a formidable power.

The old Turk Solyman, sultan of Syria, (whose situation under the caliphs of Bagdat was in many respects similar to that of the mayors of the palace, in France, under the race of Clovis) was unable, even with the assistance of his son, to stem the torrent of all these confederate princes engaged in the crusade; for their troops were better chosen than those of Peter the Hermit, and disciplined as well as their licentiousness and enthusiasm would permit.

Nicea

Nicea was taken, and the troops of Solyman's son
 1097 were twice defeated; for neither the Turks nor Arabians could at first sustain the shock of such multitudes cased in iron, nor of their large horses, nor of the forests of lances, to which they had never been accustomed.

Bohemond had the address to obtain from the crus-
 1098 saders the fertile country of Antioch. Baldwin penetrated even into Mesopotamia, where he took the city of Edeffa, and formed there a small state. At length they besieged the city of Jerusalem, which was held for the caliph of Egypt by his lieutenants. Almost all the historians assure us, that the army of the besiegers was diminished by battles, sickness, and the garrisons put into conquered towns, to twenty thousand foot and fifteen hundred horse; that Jerusalem was provided with every thing necessary, and defended by a garrison of forty thousand soldiers: they likewise add, that besides this garrison, it contained twenty thousand resolute inhabitants. Yet there is no reader, of common sense, who must not see that it is morally impossible for an army of twenty thousand men to besiege a fortified place that has a garrison of sixty thousand; but the writers of history have been always fond of the marvellous.

It is certain, however, that after a siege of five weeks Jerusalem was taken by storm, and that all who were not Christians were put to death. The hermit Peter, who from being a general was become a chaplain, was present both at the taking of the city, and at the slaughter of its inhabitants. Some Christians, whom the Mussulmen had suffered to reside in the city, conducted the conquerors into the most private recesses, in which the mothers had hid themselves with their children, and none of them were suffered to escape. Almost all the historians agree, that after this butchery the Christians, glutted with human blood, went in procession to the
 1099 spot which they were told was the sepulchre of Christ, and there burst into tears. It is very probable that they might there shew some signs of religion; but this
 tenderness,

tendernefs, expreffed by tears, was hardly compatible with fuch giddy, furious, debauched, and cruel minds: the fame man may indeed be furious and tender, but not at one and the fame time.

Elmacim relates, that the Jews having been fhut up in the fynagogue which had been granted to them by the Turks, it was fet fire to, and they were all burnt to death. This action may be credited after the horrid cruelties the crusaders had exercifed upon this unhappy people in their march.

Jerufalem was taken by the crusaders the fifth of July 1099. Alexis Comnenus being then emperor of the Eaft, Henry IV. of the Weft, and Urban II. fupreme head of the church of Rome. This pope died before he heard of this triumph of the crusade, of which he had been the author.

The lords, who were now mafters of Jerufalem, met together to elect a king of Judea, when the ecclefiaftics who followed the army repaired to the affembly, where they had the prefumption to declare, that the election that was going to be made would be void, becaufe, faid they, the choice of a patriarch ought to precede that of a fovereign.

Godfrey of Bouillon was nevertheless elected, not king, but duke of Jerufalem. Some months after, arrived a legate, named Damberto, who caufed himfelf to be nominated patriarch by the clergy; and the firft thing he did, was to take the little kingdom of Jerufalem to himfelf in the name of the pope. Godfrey of Bouillon, who had conquered the city at the hazard of his life, was obliged to yield it up to this bifhop; he however referved to himfelf the port of Joppa, and fome privileges in Jerufalem. His own patrimony, which he had abandoned, was far preferable to what he acquired in Paleftine.

C H A P. LV.

Of the Crusades after the taking of Jerusalem.—Louis the Young takes the Cross.—St. Bernard, who on other Occasions performs Miracles, prophecies Victories, and yet the Army is defeated.—Saladin takes Jerusalem.—An Account of his Conduct and Exploits.—Of the Divorce of Louis the Young.

EVER since the fourth century a third part of the globe has been ravaged by almost continual emigrations. The Huns, who came from Chinese Tartary, at length took up their quarters on the banks of the Danube, and from thence having penetrated under Attila into Gaul and Italy, they settled in Hungary. The Heruli and the Goths made themselves masters of Rome. The Vandals marched from the borders of the Baltic Sea to subdue Spain and Africa. The Burgundians invaded one part of Gaul, the Franks another. The Moors subdued the Visigoths who were in possession of Spain; while the rest of the Arabians extended their conquests into Persia, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. The Turks issued from the eastern borders of the Caspian Sea, and divided the territories conquered by the Arabians. The European crusaders over-ran Syria in far greater numbers than all those nations ever brought together in their several migrations: at the same time that the Tartar Genghis-kam was completing the conquest of Upper Asia. And yet in a very little time there remained not the least vestige of the conquests of the crusaders; whereas Genghis, as well as the Arabians, the Turks, and others, made considerable settlements at a great distance from their own country. It will perhaps not be difficult to account for this want of success in the crusaders.

The same circumstances produce the same effects. We have seen, that when Mahomet's successors had conquered many kingdoms, they were divided by discord; and the crusaders suffered nearly the same fate: only

only they had fewer conquests and were more divided. They had already formed three petty states in Asia, namely, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Edeffa; and some years after a fourth was erected, that of Tripoli, in Syria, which was given to young Bertrand, son of the count of Toulouse: but in order to conquer Tripoli, it was found necessary to make use of the vessels of the Venetians, who then entered into the crusades, and obliged the others to yield them up a part of this new conquest.

Of all these new princes who had promised to pay homage for their acquisitions to the Grecian emperor, not one kept his promise, and all were jealous of each other. In a little time these new states being divided, and subdivided, passed into many different hands; and there rose up, as in France, many different lords, as counts of Joppa, and marquises of Galilee, Sidon, Acra, and Cesarea. Solyman, who had lost Antioch and Nicea, still kept the open country, which was inhabited by clans of Mussulmen; so that under his reign, and after his decease, there was a mixture of Christians, Turks, and Arabians, constantly at war with each other; and the castles of the Turks and Christians were placed in the same neighbourhood, just in the same manner as we see the estates of the Catholics and Protestants intermingled in Germany.

Of the million that had entered into this crusade, very few remained; but as the rumour of their success was increased by common fame, new adventurers still set out from the West. Prince Hugh, whom we have already mentioned, and who was brother to Philip I. brought with him a new multitude, increased by the addition of Italians and Germans on the march. These have been computed at 300,000; but if we reduce them to two-thirds of this number, there will still be 200,000 men lost to Christendom: they were treated, near Constantinople, in much the same manner as the followers of Peter the Hermit had been: those who reached Asia were destroyed by Solyman; and prince Hugh died almost deserted in Asia Minor.

But what, in my opinion, further proves the extreme weakness of the principality of Jerusalem, is the establishment of those religious soldiers, called the Templars and Hospitallers; for it is certain that these monks, whose institution at first was to serve the sick, were not in safety, since they took up arms. Besides, we seldom hear of private associations, when the community in general is well governed.

The monks, who had devoted themselves to the service of the wounded, having made a vow, about the year 1118, to take up arms, another militia of the same kind was formed on a sudden under the name of Templars; a title which they assumed from their living near a church, which was said to have been formerly Solomon's temple. These establishments were founded by the French, or at least by the natives of a country since annexed to France. Raymond Dupuy, first grand-master and founder of the militia of Hospitallers, was born in Dauphiny.

These two orders were scarcely established by the pope's bulls, when they became rich and turned rivals; they then fought as often against each other, as against the Mussulmen. Soon after a new order was instituted in favour of the poor Germans, who had been abandoned in Palestine: these were the Teutonic monks, who afterwards, in Europe, became a militia of conquerors.

At length the situation of the Christians was so precarious, that Baldwin, the first king of Jerusalem, who reigned after the death of Godfrey his brother, was taken almost at the gates of the city by a Turkish prince.

The strength of the Christians in these conquered countries decreased every day: the first conquerors were now dead, and their successors were sunk into effeminacy. Edeffa was retaken by the Turks in the year 1140, and Jerusalem was threatened. The Greek emperors finding in their neighbours, the princes of Antioch, only new usurpers, made war upon them, and not without reason: and thus the Christians of Asia, ready to be
over-

overpowered on every side, solicited Europe for a new crusade.

The French had begun the first inundation: application was therefore made to them to begin the second. Pope Eugenius III. the disciple of St. Bernard, the founder of Clervaux, wisely chose his first master to be the instrument of a new depopulation. Never did a monk better reconcile the hurry of business with the austerity of his order than he did: none ever arrived like him at that respect which is purely personal, and is above authority itself. His fellow student, the abbot Suger, was prime minister of France; his disciple was pope: but Bernard, though no more than abbot of Clervaux, was the oracle not only of France, but of Europe.

At Vezelay in Burgundy, a scaffold was raised in the market-place, on which Bernard was seated by the side of Louis the Young, king of France. He spoke first; the king seconded him, and then received the cross from the hands of St. Bernard, all who were present followed his example. The prime minister, Suger, was of opinion however that the king ought not to neglect the certain advantages he might procure for his own dominions to go into Hungary in search of uncertain conquests; but Bernard's eloquence, and the spirit of the times, without which that eloquence would have been useless, prevailed over the counsels of the minister.

Louis the Young is described to us as a prince more scrupulous than virtuous. In one of those little civil wars, which were inevitable in France under the feudal government, the king's troops had burnt the church of Vitry, and all the people who had taken sanctuary in it had perished in the flames; it was therefore an easy matter to persuade him that he could not expiate, but by going to Palestine, a crime which he might have better repaired at home by a wise administration. His young wife Eleanor of Guienne, went with the king in this crusade, either because she then loved him, or because decency in those times required that she should accompany her husband in such an expedition.

St. Bernard had acquired such a singular reputation; that in a new assembly held at Chartres, he was elected chief of the crusade; a fact that appears almost incredible; but nothing ought to be thought so that is produced by the religious frenzy of the multitude. Bernard, however, had too much sense to expose himself to the ridicule with which he was threatened; for the example of Peter the Hermit was recent: he therefore refused the post of general, and contented himself with that of prophet.

From France he went into Germany, where he found another monk employed in preaching up the crusade; but he soon silenced this rival, who had not the pope's mission, and at length gave the red cross to the emperor Conrad III. and in the name of God publicly promised him success over the infidels. Soon after this, Philip, one of his disciples, sent word to France, that Bernard had performed many miracles in Germany: it was not indeed pretended that he raised the dead to life, but the blind received sight, the lame walked, and the sick were healed. We may reckon among these prodigies, that he every where preached to the Germans in French.

The hopes of certain victory drew after the emperor and the king of France the greatest part of the knights in their dominions; and, we are told, that in each army there were reckoned 70,000 men in complete armour, with a prodigious number of light horse, exclusive of the infantry. We cannot suppose this second emigration to have consisted of less than 300,000 persons, which added to the 1,300,000 we noticed in the former expeditions, makes the number of transplanted inhabitants amount in the whole to 1,600,000. The Germans set out first, and the French followed them. It is natural to suppose that a great part of these multitudes, on their removal into a different climate, would fall a sacrifice to diseases. Intemperance produced a mortality in Conrad's army, near the plains of Constantinople, and from thence those rumours were spread through the West of the Greeks poisoning the wells
and

and springs. The same excesses that were committed by the former crusaders, were renewed by these, which gave Manuel Comnenus the same apprehensions as they had given his grandfather Alexis.

Conrad, after having passed the Bosphorus, conducted his enterprize with an imprudence that seems to have been peculiar to the crusades. The principality of Antioch was yet in being, and the emperor might have joined those Christians of Syria, and have waited for the king of France; they must then have overpowered the enemy by numbers: but the emperor of Germany, jealous both of the prince of Antioch and the king of France, penetrated into the midst of Asia Minor, where the sultan of Iconium, who was a more able general than Conrad, contrived to draw his army among the rocks. The German cavalry being fatigued, dispirited, and incapable of acting on such ground, there fell an easy prey to the Turks, who had no other trouble than that of killing them. The emperor wounded, and with only a few fugitive troops, saved himself by flying towards Antioch, and from thence went to Jerusalem, as a pilgrim, instead of appearing there as the general of an army. The famous Frederick Barbarossa, his nephew, who succeeded him in the government of the German empire, followed him in this expedition, and learned among the Turks to exercise that courage, which the popes were to put to the severest proof.

The enterprize of Louis the Young met with the same success; besides, it must be confessed, that those who accompanied him had not more prudence than the Germans, and that they acted with even less regard to justice. Scarce were they arrived in Thrace, when the bishop of Langres proposed his making himself master of Constantinople: but the disgrace that would have been annexed to such an action was too apparent; and the success too precarious; the French army therefore crossed the Hellespont, and followed the steps of the emperor Conrad.

It cannot, I believe, have escaped the reader's observation, that these powerful Christian armies waged

war in the same countries in which Alexander was always victorious, with much fewer troops, against enemies incomparably more powerful than the Turks and Arabians were at that time. There must then have certainly been some fundamental defect, that necessarily rendered their courage useless; and this defect was probably that spirit of independence, which the feudal government had established in Europe; so that chiefs, without either skill or experience, led disorderly multitudes into unknown countries. The king of France was, like the emperor, surprized among the rocks towards Laodicea, and like him was defeated: but at Antioch he suffered certain domestic misfortunes, which affected him more sensibly than public calamities. Raymond prince of Antioch, with whom he, and queen Eleanor his wife, had taken refuge, publicly made love to that princess; and it is even said, that she forgot all the fatigues of the expedition in the arms of a young Turk, of singular beauty, named Saladin. Louis, thinking himself in danger of being taken with his wife, either by the Turks or by the prince of Antioch's troops, took her away privately from Antioch and went with her to Jerusalem; by which means he had at least the satisfaction of fulfilling the vow he had made, and being able to tell St. Bernard that he had seen Bethlehem and Nazareth. But in the course of this journey, the few troops he had left were beaten and dispersed on all sides; and, at length, 3000 of the French deserted in a body, and turned Mahometans to keep themselves from starving.

The conclusion of the whole crusade was that the emperor Conrad returned home almost alone, and that Louis the Young brought back to France only his wife and a few courtiers. At his return he dissolved his marriage with Eleanor of Guienne, under a pretext of kindred; for adultery, as we have already observed, was not sufficient to annul the sacrament of marriage; altho', by a most absurd law, the crime of marrying a second cousin was sufficient to do it. Louis, after having repudiated his wife, was not powerful enough to keep her dowry; so that he was deprived of Guienne, one of the finest provinces

provinces of France, after having lost in Asia the most flourishing army that his country had ever set on foot. A thousand desolated families in vain uttered their invectives against St. Bernard for his prophecies; who, in his own vindication, compared himself to Moses, "Who had, he said, like him, promised the Israelites, in the name of God, to lead them into a happy country, and yet saw the first generation perish in the deserts."

C H A P. LVI.

Of SALADIN.

AFTER these unfortunate expeditions, the Asiatic Christians grew more divided than ever, and the same factious spirit prevailed amongst the Mussulmen. The pretence of religion had no longer any share in political affairs; on the contrary, about the year 1166, Amaury king of Jerusalem entered into an alliance with the sultan of Egypt against the Turks; but the king of Jerusalem had no sooner signed the treaty, than he broke it.

The Christians were yet in possession of Jerusalem, and disputing with the Turks and Tartars certain territories in Syria. While Europe was exhausted by this holy war, while Andronicus Manuel ascended the tottering throne of Constantinople by the murder of his nephew, and while Frederick Barbarossa and the popes kept all Italy in arms, nature produced one of those tremendous accidents, which ought to lead men to reflection, and convince them of their own insignificancy and the little they are disputing about. An earthquake, more violent and extensive than that of 1755, destroyed most of the cities of Syria and also the little kingdom of Jerusalem. The earth opened in an hundred different places, and swallowed up men and beasts. The Turks were told by their priests that it was a judgment of God upon the Christians; and the Christians were taught to believe, that God declared himself

himself in this manner against the Turks ; so that both parties continued to butcher each other on the ruins of Syria.

In the midst of these troubles arose the great Salaheddin, whom in Europe we have named Saladin. He was of Persian extraction, from the little province of the Curdes, who have been always a warlike and independent nation. He was one of those captains who seized on the dominions of the caliphs ; but none of them were equal to him in power. In a short time he subdued Egypt, Syria, Arabia, Persia and Mesopotamia. Having made himself master of all these countries, he soon formed the design of conquering the kingdom of Jerusalem, when the violent factions, which tore in pieces this little state, hastened its ruin. Guy of Lusignan who had been crowned king, but whose title had been disputed, re-assembled in Galilee all the divided Christians whom the common danger had united, and marched against Saladin ; the bishop of Ptolemais wearing a cope over his armour, and holding in his arms a cross, which he persuaded the Christians was the identical cross on which Jesus Christ suffered. However, all the Christians were either killed or taken prisoners ; when the captive king, who expected nothing but death, was astonished at being treated by Saladin, in the same manner as prisoners of war are treated at present by the most humane generals.

Saladin with his own hand presented Lusignan a cup of liquor cooled with snow. When the king had drank, he offered the cup to one of his captains, whose name was Rainaud de Chatillon. It was an inviolable custom established among the Mussulmen, and is still preserved among some of the Arabians, never to put those prisoners to death to whom they had given meat or drink. This ancient law of hospitality was regarded as sacred by Saladin, who would not suffer Rainaud de Chatillon to drink after the king ; for the captain had frequently violated his promise, and the conqueror had sworn to punish him. To shew therefore that he knew how to punish as well as to shew mercy, he struck off

the

the h
fabre
the in
grant
which
her to
ing a
On h
came
that
other
prison
rosity
part
had b
rose-
a ma
had
carve
" va
" Je
Sa
with
the c
tians
of a
swear
but I
W
the z
man
by th
In
conv
after
Euro
ever
idola
Den
prea
V

the head of the perfidious wretch with one blow of his sabre. Being arrived at the gates of Jerusalem, which the inhabitants were now incapable of defending, he¹¹⁸⁷ granted the queen, Lusignan's wife, a capitulation, which she could not hope to obtain; and permitted her to retire wheresoever she pleased, without demanding any ransom from the Greeks who lived in the city. On his making his entry into Jerusalem, many women came and threw themselves at his feet; some begging that he would restore to them their husbands, and others their children or their fathers, who were his prisoners; and he granted their requests with a generosity, which till then had been unexampled in that part of the world. Saladin caused the mosque, which had been converted into a church, to be washed with rose-water by the Christians themselves, and placed in it a magnificent chair, which Noradin, sultan of Aleppo, had made with his own hands: he also caused to be carved on the door these words, "*King Saladin, the servant of God, set up this inscription, after God had taken Jerusalem by his hands.*"

Saladin established Mahometan schools; but notwithstanding his attachment to his religion, he restored the church of the holy sepulchre to the Oriental Christians. It must also be added, that within the compass of a year he granted Guy of Lusignan his liberty, on swearing never to take up arms against his deliverer; but Lusignan paid no regard to his oath.

While Asia Minor continued thus to be the scene of the zeal, the glory, the crimes and the misfortunes of so many thousand crusaders; the fury of propagating religion by the sword was spread to the extremity of the North.

In a former part of this Essay we saw Charlemagne converting the North of Germany with fire and sword: after that we observed the idolatrous Danes making Europe tremble, and conquering Normandy, without ever attempting to force the conquered to embrace idolatry: but scarcely was Christianity established in Denmark, Saxony and Scandinavia, than a crusade was preached up against the Pagans of the North, whom

they called Sclaves, or Slaves; from whence the country which borders on Hungary is named Slavonia. The Christians took up arms against them from Bremen to the extremities of Scandinavia. Above 100,000 crusaders carried destruction among these idolaters, killing vast multitudes, and making no converts. We may still add the loss of 300,000 men to 1,600,000 of which the fanaticism of those times had already deprived Europe.

In the mean time the Christians lost all they had possessed in Asia, except Antioch, Tripoli, Joppa and the city of Tyre; all the rest was in the possession of Saladin, either in his own person, or by his son-in-law, the sultan of Iconium or Cogni.

The rumour of Saladin's victories threw all Europe into confusion; and pope Clement III. stirred up France, Germany, and England against him. Philip 1188 Augustus, who then reigned in France, and old Henry II. king of England, suspended their quarrels, and only vied with each other in their readiness to succour Asia. They both ordered that such of their subjects as would not take up the cross, should pay the value of the tenth part of their revenues and moveable effects to defray the expence of the armament. This was called the Saladin tythe, a tax which served as a trophy of the conqueror's glory.

The emperor Frederick Barbarossa, who is so famous for the persecutions he suffered from the popes, and for what he made them suffer, took up the cross almost at the same time. He seemed to be among the Christians of Asia, what Saladin was among the Turks, an able politician, a good soldier, tried by fortune, and he was at the head of an army of 150,000 fighting men. He was the first who took the precaution to order, that none should be suffered to enter into the crusade, but such as had at least 150 livres current money; to the end, that every one might by his own means prevent those frightful dearths, which had contributed to the ruin of the preceding armies.

Frederick,

Frederick, however, was obliged to begin with fighting against the Greeks. The court of Constantinople, weary of being continually menaced by the Latins, at length formed an alliance with Saladin, which was condemned by the rest of Europe, notwithstanding its being apparently inevitable; for no alliance can take place between natural enemies, but from necessity. Our present treaties with the Turks, though perhaps less necessary, do not create such murmurs. Frederick forced a passage through Thrace sword in hand, against Isaac Angelus the emperor, and after conquering the Greeks, obtained two victories over the Sultan of Cogni; but having been imprudent enough, when in a profuse sweat, to bathe himself in a river, thought to be the Cydnus, he brought on a disorder of which he died, so that his conquests were useless. These conquests however had been dearly bought, since his son the duke of Swabia could gather together no more than seven or eight thousand men at most out of the 150,000 that had followed his father: these he conducted to Antioch, and joined them to the remains of the army of Guy of Lusignan, king of Jerusalem, who was still resolved to attack Saladin his conqueror, notwithstanding his oath, and the inferiority of his forces.

After many battles, none of which were decisive, this son of Frederick Barbarossa, who might have been emperor of the West, lost his life near Ptolemais. Those who have written of his dying a martyr to chastity, and asserted, that he might have preserved his life by the use of women, have shewn that they are bold panegyrist, and but very indifferent philosophers. The same thing has since been said of Louis VIII. king of France.

Asia Minor might be compared to a gulph into which all Europe came to precipitate themselves. Not only was the immense army of the emperor Frederick lost, but the fleets of English, French, Italians, and Germans, that preceded the arrival of Philip Augustus,

and Richard Cœur-de-Lion, brought fresh crusaders, and fresh victims.

At length the kings of France and England arrived before Ptolemais in Syria; and almost all the Christians in the East were collected to besiege that city. Saladin was then near the Euphrates, where he was embarrassed by a civil war; and when the two kings had joined their forces to those of the eastern Christians, the whole army was computed to amount to above 300,000 men.

1190 Ptolemais was indeed taken; but the discord that necessarily arose between two such rivals in glory and in interest, as Philip and Richard, did more mischief than these 300,000 performed successful exploits. Philip, tired with these divisions, and still more with the superiority assumed on all occasions by Richard, whom he considered as his vassal, came back into his own dominions, which he would have done well perhaps never to have quitted, but to which he certainly ought not to have returned without more reputation than he could be said to bring with him.

Richard remained master of the field of honour, but not of that multitude of crusaders, who were more divided by their animosities than the two kings had been; which made the most heroic courage ineffectual. Saladin, who returned victorious from Mesopotamia, gave battle to the crusaders near Cesarea, when Richard had the glory of dismounting that prince, which was almost all that he gained in this memorable expedition.

Fatigue, diseases, skirmishes, and continual quarrels, 1191 ruined this great army, and Richard returned with more glory indeed than Philip Augustus, but in a manner much less prudent. He set sail with a single vessel, and that being wrecked on the coast of Venice, he traversed half of Germany in disguise, and but ill attended. He had offended a duke of Austria while he was in Syria, by his haughty behaviour, and yet he was so imprudent as to pass through his dominions: on which the duke loaded him with chains, and delivered him up 1193 to the barbarous and cowardly emperor Henry VI. who kept him in confinement as an enemy taken in war, and

and demanded it is said an hundred thousand marks of silver for his ransom. But an hundred thousand marks of silver would according to the present value of money, make five millions of livers, a sum which England in those days was not able to furnish; it was therefore probably only an hundred thousand *marcas*, that is, about an hundred thousand of our present crowns.

Saladin, who had entered into a treaty with Richard, by which he left the Christians the sea coast from Tyre to Joppa, continued faithful to his engagement; 1195 but died three years after at Damascus, admired even by the Christians. In his last illness, instead of the banners which used to be displayed before the gate of his palace, he substituted the sheet in which he was to be buried; and the person who carried this standard of death, cried with a loud voice, "This is all that Saladin, the conqueror of the East, has obtained by his victories." We are told that he left by his last will benefactions to be equally distributed among the poor Mahometans, Jews, and Christians; intending by this bequest to teach this doctrine, that all men are brethren, and that in order to entitle them to receive our assistance, we ought not to enquire what they believe, but what they suffer.

The zeal for crusades was not extinguished; neither did the wars carried on by Philip Augustus against England and Germany prevent a great number of the French lords from turning adventurers. The principal promoter of this emigration was a Flemish prince, as Godfrey of Bouillon had been the chief of the first. This was Baldwin count of Flanders: 4000 knights, 9000 esquires, and 25,000 foot, composed this new crusade, which may be called the fifth.

Venice, which supported its commerce by war, grew every day more formidable: it was thought expedient to apply to this republic for assistance rather than to any other state of Europe; for the Venetians were able to fit out larger fleets than either the kings of England, Germany, or France had it in their power to furnish. These industrious republicans gained by this crusade

not

not only wealth, but additional territories. In the first place, they were paid eighty-five thousand crowns of gold merely to transport the troops; and then they employed this very army, to which they added fifty galleys, 1202 in making conquests in Dalmatia.

Pope Innocent III. either as a matter of form, or because he was jealous of their increasing grandeur, excommunicated them; but these excommunicated crusaders nevertheless took Zara and its territories, which still increased the power of the Venetians.

This crusade was different from all the others; for the crusaders found Constantinople divided, and the former ones had always to do with emperors well established on the throne. The Venetians, together with the count of Flanders, the marquiss of Montserrat, and, in fine, the principal commanders, who are seldom deficient in point of policy, when the multitude is wild and licentious, perceived that the time was come for executing the ancient project against the Grecian empire. So that the Christians directed their crusade against the first prince in Christendom.

END OF VOL. I.